

EXHIBIT 1

***REDACTED VERSION
OF DOCUMENT(S)
SOUGHT TO BE SEALED***

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

WAYMO LLC,

Plaintiff,

vs.

No. 3:17-cv-00939-WHA

UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.;

OTTOMOTTO LLC; OTTO TRUCKING,

INC.,

Defendants.

_____ /

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF LARRY PAGE

PALO ALTO, CALIFORNIA

MONDAY, JULY 17, 2017

BY: ANDREA M. IGNACIO, CSR, RPR, CRR, CCRR, CLR ~

CSR LICENSE NO. 9830

JOB NO. 2658732

PAGES 1 - 219

Page 1

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

WAYMO LLC,

Plaintiff,

vs.

No. 3:17-cv-00939-WHA

UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.;

OTTOMOTTO LLC; OTTO TRUCKING,

INC.,

Defendants.

-----/

Videotaped Deposition of Larry Page, taken
on behalf of the Defendants, on July 17, 2017, at
Wilson Sonsini Goodrich & Rosati, 601 California
Avenue, Palo Alto, California, beginning
12:06 a.m., and commencing at 4:54 p.m., Pursuant
to Notice, and before me, ANDREA M. IGNACIO, CSR,
RPR, CRR, CLR ~ License No. 9830.

1 A P P E A R A N C E S :

2
3 FOR THE PLAINTIFFS:

4
5 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN LLP

6 By: JEFFREY W. NARDINELLI, Esq.

7 DAVID PERLSON, Esq.

8 50 California Street, Suite 2200

9 San Francisco, California 94111

10 Phone: 415.875.6600

11 david.perlson@quinnemanuel.com

12 jeffnardinelli@quinnemanuel.com

13
14 FOR THE DEFENDANTS UBER TECHNOLOGIES INC.:

15
16 MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP

17 By: ARTURO GONZALEZ, Esq.

18 425 Market Street

19 San Francisco, California 94105-2482

20 Phone: 415.268.7562

21 agonzalez@mofo.com

22
23
24
25
Page 3

1 A P P E A R A N C E S: (Cont.)

2
3 FOR THE DEFENDANTS UBER TECHNOLOGIES INC.:

4
5 BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP

6 By: CAIN NORRIS, Esq.

7 1401 New York Avenue, NW

8 Washington, D.C. 20005

9 Phone: 202.274.1135

10 cnorris@bsfllp.com

11
12 FOR THE DEFENDANTS OTTO TRUCKING, INC.:

13
14 GOODWIN & PROCTER LLP

15 By: I. NEEL CHATTERJEE, Esq.

16 155 Commonwealth Drive

17 Menlo Park, California 94025

18 Phone: 650.752.3256

19 nchatterjee@goodwinlaw.com

1 A P P E A R A N C E S : (Cont.)

2

3 FOR ALPHABET AND THE WITNESS:

4

5 KEKER VAN NEST & PETERS

6 By: ROBERT VAN NEST, Esq.

7 JENNIFER HUBER, Esq.

8 633 Battery Street

9 San Francisco, California 94111

10 Phone: 415.391.5400

11 rvannest@keker.com

12

13 ALSO PRESENT:

14 Ramon Perraza, Videographer

15 Nicole T. Bartow, Uber

16 Aaron Bergstrom, Uber

17 Nora Puckett, Alphabet

18 Katherine Oacavera, Alphabet

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I N D E X

WITNESS: Larry Page

EXAMINATION	PAGE
Mr. Rodriguez	12, 195
Mr. Chatterjee	160

E X H I B I T S

EXHIBIT	PAGE
Exhibit 1085 6-17-15 Project Chauffeur Bonus Statement, Bates WAYMO-UBER-00014504 - '05	16
Exhibit 1086 Dec 2015 Project Chauffeur Bonus Statement, Bates WAYMO-UBER-00013908	16
Exhibit 1087 Project Chauffeur Execution Version, Bates WAYMO-UBER-00026147 - '140	64
Exhibit 1088 5-25-11 E-mail, Subject: Chauffeur compensation, Bates WAYMO-UBER-00026142 - '43	80
Exhibit 1089 7-9-11 E-mail, Subject: Chauffeur +hanke, Bates WAYMO-UBER-00026144 - '46	90

1	E X H I B I T S (Cont.)		
2	EXHIBIT		PAGE
3			
4	Exhibit 1090	1-27-16 E-mail, Subject:	99
5		Chauffeur; It's time for me to	
6		move on, Bates WAYMO-UBER-00011799	
7	Exhibit 1091	1-27-16 E-mail, Subject: It's	102
8		time for me to move on, Bates	
9		WAYMO-UBER-00011799	
10	Exhibit 1092	3-16-11 E-mail, Subject: Chauffeur	110
11		Quick Sync, Bates	
12		WAYMO-UBER-00026141	
13	Exhibit 1093	1-9-16 E-mail, Subject: Chauffeur	113
14		██████████ urgently needed, Bates	
15		WAYMO-UBER-00006311 - '12	
16	Exhibit 1094	1-25-16 E-mail, Subject:	122
17		Chauffeur: Plan of action for	
18		next 342 days, Bates	
19		WAYMO-UBER-00011779	
20	Exhibit 1095	3-8-16 E-mail, Subject: Anthony,	127
21		Bates WAYMO-UBER-00022505	
22	Exhibit 1096	4-11-5 E-mail, Subject: ██████████	██████████
23	██████████	██████████ Bates WAYMO-UBER-00026174	
24	Exhibit 1097	12-6-13 E-mail, Subject: ██████████	██████████
25	██████████	██████████, Bates WAYMO-UBER-00026168	

1	E X H I B I T S (Cont.)		
2	EXHIBIT		PAGE
3			
4	Exhibit 1098	2-7-14 E-mail, Subject: Catch up,	148
5		Bates WAYMO-UBER-00029264	
6	Exhibit 1099	11-12-14 E-mail, Subject: Update,	151
7		Bates, WAYMO-UBER-00029346	
8	Exhibit 1100	3-29-15 E-mail, Subject: [REDACTED],	157
9		Bates WAYMO-UBER-00029349	
10	Exhibit 1101	3-1-15 E-mail, Subject: [REDACTED],	158
11		Bates WAYMO-UBER-00029352	
12	Exhibit 1102	9-23-15 Letter Chris Urmson,	163
13		Bates WAYMO-UBER-00014482 - 88	
14	Exhibit 1103	10-24-14 E-mail, Subject: Anthony,	168
15		Bates WAYMO-UBER-00009502	
16	Exhibit 1104	3-11-15 E-mail, Subject: [REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
17	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED], Bates WAYMO-UBER-00026174	
18	Exhibit 1105	8-4-15 E-mail, Subject:	175
19		Confidential, Bates	
20		WAYMO-UBER-00006309	
21	Exhibit 1106	1-27-16 E-mail, Subject: Anthony,	180
22		Bates WAYMO-UBER-00011805	
23	Exhibit 1107	2004 Founders' IPO Letter	197
24	Exhibit 1108	1-23-16 E-mail, Subject: Role on	195
25		Chauffeur, Bates WAYMO-UBER-00011773	

E X H I B I T S (Cont.)

EXHIBIT	PAGE
---------	------

Exhibit 1109	1-13-16 E-mail, Subject:	213
--------------	--------------------------	-----

Chauffeur [REDACTED] urgently

needed, Bates WAYMO-UBER-00011746

Exhibit 1110	2-18-16 E-mail, Subject: Chauffeur	186
--------------	------------------------------------	-----

Plan payments for former employees,

Bates WAYMO-UBER-00012019

Exhibit 1111	4-1-16 E-mail, Subject: Quick	185
--------------	-------------------------------	-----

follow-up, Bates WAYMO-UBER-00012097

P R E V I O U S L Y M A R K E D E X H I B I T S

Exhibit 1031 [REDACTED]

1	PALO ALTO, CALIFORNIA	10:47
2	MONDAY, JULY 17, 2017	10:49
3	12:06 P.M.	10:49
4		10:49
5		10:49
6		10:49
7	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Good afternoon. We are on	10:54
8	the record at 12:06 p.m. on July 17th, 2017. This is	12:06
9	the videotaped deposition of Mr. Larry Page.	12:06
10	My name is Ramon Perraza, here with our court	12:06
11	reporter, Andrea Ignacio. We are here from Veritext	12:06
12	Legal Solutions at the request of counsel for the	12:06
13	defendant.	12:06
14	This deposition is being held at Wilson	12:06
15	Sonsini in Palo Alto.	12:06
16	The caption of this case is Waymo, LLC	12:06
17	versus Uber Technologies, Inc., et al. Case	12:06
18	No. 3:17-CV-00939-WHA.	12:06
19	Please note that audio and video recording	12:06
20	will take place unless all parties have agreed to go	12:06
21	off the record. Microphones are sensitive and may	12:07
22	pick up whispers or private conversations.	12:07
23	At this time, Counsel, please identify	12:07
24	yourselves for the record and state whom you	12:07
25	represent.	12:07

1 MR. GONZALEZ: Arturo Gonzalez from 12:07
2 Morrison & Foerster, on behalf of Uber. 12:07
3 MS. BARTOW: Nicole Bartow, in-house counsel 12:07
4 at Uber. 12:07
5 MR. BERGSTROM: Aaron Bergstrom, in-house 12:07
6 counsel at Uber. 12:07
7 MR. NORRIS: Ken Norris, Boies, Schiller & 12:07
8 Flexner, on behalf of Uber. 12:07
9 MR. CHATTERJEE: Neel Chatterjee, on behalf 12:07
10 of Otto Trucking. 12:07
11 MR. NARDINELLI: Jeff Nardinelli of Quinn 12:07
12 Emanuel, on behalf of Waymo. 12:07
13 MS. HUBER: Jennifer Huber, Kecker, Van Nest & 12:07
14 Peters, on behalf of Alphabet and Mr. Page. 12:07
15 MS. PUCKETT: Nora Puckett, Alphabet. 12:07
16 MS. OACAVERA: Katherine Oacavera, Alphabet. 12:07
17 MR. PERLSON: David Perlson, Quinn Emanuel, 12:07
18 for Waymo. 12:07
19 MR. VAN NEST: And Bob Van Nest, Kecker, 12:07
20 Van Nest & Peters, for Alphabet and Mr. Page. 12:07
21 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The court reporter may now 12:07
22 swear in the witness.
23 ///
24 ///
25 ///

1 LARRY PAGE,
2 having been sworn as a witness
3 by the Certified Shorthand Reporter,
4 testified as follows:
5

6 EXAMINATION

7 BY MR. GONZALEZ:

8 Q Sir, you are one of the founders of Google; 12:08
9 correct? 12:08

10 A Yes. 12:08

11 Q And you're currently the CEO of Alphabet? 12:08

12 A That's correct. 12:08

13 Q Alphabet is the parent company of both Google 12:08
14 and Waymo; is that right? 12:08

15 A That's right. 12:08

16 Q Sir, I'd like to start by asking you some 12:08
17 questions about the bonus that was paid to Anthony 12:08
18 Levandowski. He received a bonus that was in excess 12:08
19 of \$120 million; is that right? 12:08

20 A I'm not familiar with the exact amount, but 12:08
21 that sounds correct. 12:08

22 Q You recall it was over 100 million? 12:08

23 A I recall it was large. 12:08

24 Q Did you approve that bonus? 12:08

25 A I was definitely aware of it. I'm not sure 12:08

Page 12

1 of the process for granting him the bonus. 12:08

2 Q Did you agree with the amount of the bonus? 12:08

3 A There was some process during the 12:08

4 compensation that arrived at that, and I don't think I 12:08

5 participated in that. 12:08

6 Q You did not participate in it? 12:08

7 A I did not participate in the process of that. 12:08

8 Q Who did? 12:08

9 A There was a -- I know there was a, you know, 12:09

10 process by which they decided what the bonus payouts 12:09

11 were. 12:09

12 Q Do you know of anybody in Project Chauffeur 12:09

13 who received a bonus that was higher, greater, than 12:09

14 Anthony Levandowski? 12:09

15 A I don't recall the amounts, but I think it 12:09

16 was [REDACTED]. 12:09

17 Q Did you think it was appropriate for 12:09

18 Mr. Levandowski to receive [REDACTED]? 12:09

19 A Not sure I considered that question. 12:09

20 Q Well, thinking back on it today, do you think 12:09

21 it's appropriate for Mr. Levandowski to have received 12:09

22 [REDACTED]? 12:09

23 A I think that we did -- we built a program 12:09

24 that generated a lot of success for the Chauffeur 12:09

25 program that was start-up-like, and I think we got -- 12:09

1 we got a good -- good outcome of that. 12:09

2 Q Do you believe that Mr. Levandowski 12:09

3 contributed to the positive outcome? 12:09

4 A I'm still learning about that, I feel. 12:10

5 Q You said that it was start-up-like. 12:10

6 By that, do you mean that the bonus system 12:10

7 was set up in order to encourage employees to stay as 12:10

8 though it were a start-up? 12:10

9 A I don't think that was the main point of it, 12:10

10 I think, in my mind. Really, to incentivize really 12:10

11 good outcomes, and really focus on achieving those 12:10

12 outcomes. 12:10

13 Q Do you recall that there was concern that, 12:10

14 without a bonus program, some of the Project Chauffeur 12:10

15 people would leave and set up their own start-up? 12:10

16 A I don't recall that exact concern. But, in 12:10

17 any effort, retention is always something that you 12:10

18 would focus on. 12:10

19 Q At Google, do you have something that you 12:10

20 call autonomous units? 12:10

21 A I think at some points we did. 12:10

22 Q And autonomous -- 12:10

23 A That's not -- that's not typically what we 12:10

24 would do today, I think. 12:10

25 Q Understood. 12:11

6 | believe, but that was quite a while ago. 12:11

23	MR. GONZALEZ: Let me show you a document	12:12
----	--	-------

25

///

12:12

6	Bates stamp No. '14504.	12:12
---	-------------------------	-------

Page 17

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

1

■

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

■

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

■

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

■

■

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

■

■

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

■

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

■

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

■

■

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

■

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

■

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

■

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

■

■

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

■

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

■

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

■

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

■

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

■

■

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

■

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

■

■

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

■

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

■

■

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

■

[REDACTED]

12:15

23

Q I don't know.

12:15

24

A Is that what you're asking me? No, I don't

12:15

25

think there is.

12:16

Page 18

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

1 Q That's what I'm trying to figure out. 12:16

2 A I don't think there is. 12:16

3 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] 12:16

1 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] 12:17
6 MR. VAN NEST: I'll object to the extent the 12:17
7 question may call for privileged information. 12:17
8 Don't disclose the content of any discussion 12:17
9 you had with Mr. Drummond. 12:17
10 MR. GONZALEZ: At this point -- 12:17
11 MR. VAN NEST: But otherwise, you may answer. 12:17
12 MR. GONZALEZ: -- at this point, I'm just 12:17
13 asking yes or no. 12:17
14 Q Do you remember anything? 12:17
15 A Sorry. Can you -- can you restate it -- 12:17
16 Q Sure. 12:17
17 A -- or state it again? 12:17
18 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] 12:17
23 A No, I don't recall that. 12:17
24 Q Even generally? 12:17
25 A No. 12:17

1 Q And, sitting here today, you believe it was 12:17
2 likely that Mr. Drummond was involved. 12:17
3 Do you know for sure one way or the other? 12:17
4 A I mean, I don't recall. It would be highly 12:17
5 unusual for us not to review this, you know, as part 12:17
6 of our management. 12:18
7 Q Did you believe, in December of 2015, that 12:18
8 Anthony Levandowski had made significant contributions 12:18
9 to Project Chauffeur? 12:18
10 A I'm just trying to get the time frame 12:18
11 straight in my head. December of 2015 -- when did he 12:18
12 leave? 12:18
13 Q He left the following month. 12:18
14 A Okay. 12:18
15 Q So, in December of 2015, before he left 12:18
16 Google's employment, did you believe at that time that 12:18
17 he had made significant contributions to Project 12:18
18 Chauffeur? 12:18
19 A I mean, I think he's definitely been a 12:18
20 significant person in the history of the project. 12:18
21 Q And tell me why you believe that. If you can 12:18
22 elaborate. 12:18
23 What is it that he did that, in your mind, 12:18
24 makes his contribution significant? 12:18
25 A Well, I didn't say that. I said he's been a 12:18

1 significant person. I think it has yet to be 12:18
2 determined whether it's a positive or negative 12:18
3 contribution. 12:18
4 Q All right. 12:18
5 What do you mean by "a significant person"? 12:19
6 A Well, he was one of the leaders on the team 12:19
7 for most of his history and had a significant kind of 12:19
8 role as a result of that. 12:19
9 Q You would not have approved of a bonus of 12:19
10 over \$100 million if he hadn't made a significant 12:19
11 contribution. 12:19
12 Can we agree on that? 12:19
13 A I guess I'm questioning -- what is the 12:19
14 purpose of that question? 12:19
15 No one decided to pay me billions of dollars. 12:19
16 Q No, but -- 12:19
17 A So -- 12:19
18 Q -- you were the CEO at the time that he got 12:19
19 the bonus; right? 12:19
20 A I did not have discretion not to pay the 12:19
21 bonus, as far as I could tell. 12:19
22 Q Per the contract, that was your 12:19
23 understanding? 12:19
24 A Yes. 12:19
25 Q Did you ever express concern to anyone that 12:19

1 the bonus was too high that was being paid to 12:19
2 Mr. Levandowski? 12:19
3 A Well, as I kind of just stated, I think 12:19
4 that's -- I've stated we were focused on getting a 12:19
5 start-up-like compensation system. And start-ups pay 12:19
6 people a lot of money if they do something 12:19
7 significant -- if the start-up does something 12:20
8 significant. 12:20
9 And, I'm sure many people would argue those 12:20
10 numbers are too big, but that system seems to work 12:20
11 pretty well. 12:20
12 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] 12:20
16 Q Can you think of any other Google employee, 12:20
17 during your entire tenure, who has received a bonus in 12:20
18 excess of \$100 million for anything? 12:20
19 A I mean, we've paid a number of Google 12:20
20 employees a lot of money. You know, I don't recall 12:20
21 the exact amounts. But people have made a lot more 12:20
22 money than that as part of Google, including myself. 12:20
23 I think the terminology of "bonus" is a 12:20
24 little bit strange, because we were working -- this is 12:20
25 an early version of a program to offer people 12:20

1 start-up-like compensation. So, I think that was sort 12:21

2 of working as intended. 12:21

3 Q All right. 12:21

4 Setting aside the time that Google went 12:21

5 public, and when people received whatever they 12:21

6 received, setting that aside, was there any other 12:21

7 occasion where any employee received more than 12:21

8 \$100 million for what you described as "start-up-like 12:21

9 compensation"? 12:21

10 A I mean, I don't recall exactly. I'm sure 12:21

11 there is someone who can answer that question 12:21

12 accurately. 12:21

13 Q Okay. 12:21

14 A But again, this was one of our early programs 12:21

15 like that. So, it wouldn't surprise me if this was 12:21

16 one of the earlier ones that we had done. 12:21

17 Q Sitting here today, can you recall of any 12:21

18 other employee who received more than \$100 million in 12:21

19 what you've described as start-up compensation at 12:21

20 Google? 12:21

21 A Well, I've already stated this is one of our 12:21

22 earlier programs. So no, I can't think of one. But 12:21

23 nor do I think that's, like, so unusual, as you're -- 12:22

24 as you're implying. 12:22

25 Q You're saying it's not unusual to pay 12:22

1 somebody a bonus of over \$100 million? 12:22

2 A I don't -- I don't think characterizing it as 12:22
3 a bonus is correct. I think it's more like a start-up 12:22
4 compensation, which would be more like equity. We 12:22
5 have executives that are well compensated and 12:22
6 certainly make a lot of money and so on. 12:22

7 So anyway, I don't think that it's so far 12:22
8 outside of the norm for Silicon Valley compensation. 12:22

9 Q Can you tell me what, in your mind, did 12:22
10 Anthony Levandowski contribute to Project Chauffeur? 12:22

11 A I mean, again, I'm, you know, CEO of the 12:22
12 parent company of the company there, so I think I have 12:22
13 limited ability to answer that question. 12:22

14 My impression of Anthony is that he was, you 12:22
15 know, an early pioneer in the self-driving space, and 12:23
16 was pretty interested in a lot of the technology 12:23
17 aspects. 12:23

18 His specialty seemed to be -- he certainly 12:23
19 had a lot of knowledge of LiDAR, but I'm not -- and 12:23
20 hardware in general, maybe, but I'm not really expert 12:23
21 on those points. 12:23

22 Q When he worked at Google, you had a number of 12:23
23 conversations yourself with Mr. Levandowski over the 12:23
24 years; correct? 12:23

25 A Yeah, I mean, I've certainly talked with him 12:23

1 from time to time, usually with other people, I think. 12:23

2 Q There were times when he visited your home; 12:23

3 is that right? 12:23

4 A I don't recall that, but I'm -- it's 12:23

5 possible. 12:23

6 Q Do you also have a ranch property? 12:23

7 A Yes. 12:23

8 Q What is it called? 12:23

9 A I'm not sure which one you mean or -- or -- 12:24

10 so maybe you can give me more context. 12:24

11 Q Is there one called [REDACTED]? 12:24

12 A No. 12:24

13 Q What are your ranches called? 12:24

14 A [REDACTED] is a project that I believe Anthony 12:24

15 was working on. I don't think that's the name of a 12:24

16 ranch. 12:24

17 Q What are your ranches called? 12:24

18 A I mean, there's one maybe they're referring 12:24

19 to where some testing has happened. 12:24

20 Is that what you're talking about? 12:24

21 Q Yes. 12:24

22 A What is the context here? 12:24

23 Q I just want to know what it's called, so we 12:24

24 at least are communicating about the same location. 12:24

25 A Well, maybe you can tell me which location 12:24

Page 27

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

1 that you'd come up with, including [REDACTED]? 12:25

2 A I mean, I don't recall that, but I know he 12:25

3 was involved in that later. 12:25

4 Q When you say "he was involved in that later," 12:25

5 what do you mean by "later"? 12:25

6 A Well, I mean, after the initial 12:25

7 brainstorming. 12:25

8 [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] 12:26

Page 28

Veritext Legal Solutions
866 299-5127

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

1

■

■

■

■

■

■

■

■

■

■

12

13

14

15

■

■

■

■

■

■

■

■

■

■

[REDACTED]

■

■

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

■

[REDACTED]

■

■

[REDACTED]

Q And I appreciate that, and it can be

designated attorneys' eyes only.

I'm just trying to make the point that you're

working on [REDACTED]

■

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

■

■

[REDACTED]

■

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

■

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

12:28

12:28

12:28

12:28

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

12:28

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

1

■

■

■

■

■

■

8

9

10

11

12

■

■

■

■

■

■

■

■

■

■

■

■

■

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

■

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

■

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

12:29

Q

I -- I appreciate that. And again, this can

12:29

be designated attorneys' eyes only. It's not going to

12:29

be released publicly, but -- and -- and I actually

12:29

think some of it may already be public.

12:29

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

■

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

■

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

■

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

■

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

■

[REDACTED]

12:29

Page 31

1	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
█	█ [REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
█	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
█	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
█	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
█	█ [REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
█	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
█	█ [REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
█	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
█	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
█	[REDACTED]	12:30
█	█ [REDACTED]	12:30
12	Q Isn't it true that you asked him to be	12:30
13	involved?	12:30
14	A No, I don't think that's a correct	12:30
15	characterization.	12:30
16	Q All right.	12:30
17	Tell me what is your understanding. █	[REDACTED]
█	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
█	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
█	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
█	█ [REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
█	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
█	█ [REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
█	█ [REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
█	█ [REDACTED]	12:30

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

1

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] 12:32

25 And you asked another question as well. 12:32

Page 34

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

1 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] 12:33
15 Q And what was he doing before? 12:33
16 A He was CEO of Udacity. 12:33
17 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] 12:34
25 MR. GONZALEZ: Q. Did somebody approve of 12:34

Page 35

1 it? 12:34

2 A I'm not sure of the legal process that we 12:34

3 went through there. 12:34

4 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[illegible]

14	Q	Aren't you currently testing autonomous	12:37
15		vehicles in Phoenix?	12:37
16	A	I believe so, yes.	12:37
17	Q	And picking up passengers and taking them	12:37
18		from point A to point B in autonomous vehicles?	12:37
19	A	We have a [REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
20		[REDACTED], yeah.	12:37
21	Q	And, when did Google decide for the first	12:37
22		time to explore the possibility of doing that?	12:37
23	A	Of doing that exact thing?	12:37
24	Q	No. Just [REDACTED].	12:37
25	A	I don't -- I don't know.	12:37

1 Q Google invested in Uber; correct? 12:38

2 A Yes. 12:38

3 Q Do you recall when? 12:38

4 A My answer is yes. 12:38

5 Q Do you recall when? 12:38

6 A No, I don't remember when we did that. 12:38

7 Q And how much did Google invest in Uber? 12:38

8 A It was a pretty substantial sum. I mean, 12:38

9 it's [REDACTED]. 12:38

10 Q Do you remember [REDACTED]? 12:38

11 A I'm trying to remember. No, I don't remember 12:38

12 [REDACTED]. A small number, I think. 12:38

13 Q Do you recall that Uber appointed David 12:38

14 Drummond to its Board of Directors when you made your 12:38

15 investment? 12:38

16 A I think David was on -- on the board, yes. 12:38

17 Q He was not on the board? 12:38

18 A I said David was on the board, yeah. 12:38

19 Q And, do you recall that he was on the board 12:38

20 at the time that Google made its investment? 12:38

21 A I don't recall that. 12:39

22 Q Was due diligence done by Google before that 12:39

23 investment? 12:39

24 A I have no knowledge of that, but I've never 12:39

25 heard of a case where we did not do that. 12:39

1 Q It's pretty standard to do due diligence 12:39
2 before you go and make a significant investment; fair? 12:39
3 A Yeah. It was done through Google Ventures. 12:39
4 That's a little bit different than a corporate 12:39
5 investment, but yeah. 12:39
6 Q Different in what way? 12:39
7 A If you're going to buy a company or 12:39
8 something, you would do more thorough diligence. 12:39
9 Q When you say "more thorough diligence," what 12:39
10 do you mean by that? 12:39
11 A I don't know. 12:39
12 Q During the time that you've been president or 12:39
13 CEO of Google, Google has made a number of 12:39
14 acquisitions; correct? 12:39
15 A Yes. 12:39
16 Q And, before you make acquisitions, it's 12:39
17 standard to do due diligence; correct? 12:39
18 A Yes. 12:40
19 Q And one thing that sometimes happens is, you 12:40
20 include indemnification provisions when you acquire 12:40
21 companies; correct? 12:40
22 A I'm not familiar with that, but... 12:40
23 Q Isn't it true that, from time to time, when 12:40
24 Google acquires companies, you agree with the company 12:40
25 that you're purchasing that if they get sued, you will 12:40

1 defend them? 12:40

2 MR. VAN NEST: Object to form. 12:40

3 THE WITNESS: I'm not familiar with all of 12:40

4 the agreements that we make. 12:40

5 MR. GONZALEZ: Q. Are you familiar generally 12:40

6 with that type of provision, where you buy a company, 12:40

7 and you agree that if they get sued, you will defend 12:40

8 them? 12:40

9 MR. VAN NEST: Object to form. 12:40

10 THE WITNESS: Yeah, I'm not that familiar 12:40

11 with those things. 12:40

12 MR. GONZALEZ: Q. Do you recall the time 12:40

13 period that Mr. Drummond sat on Uber's board? 12:40

14 A No. I assume that's public record, though. 12:40

15 Q Isn't it true that, when Mr. Drummond sat on 12:40

16 Uber's board, Google was making plans to compete with 12:40

17 Uber? 12:41

18 MR. VAN NEST: Object to form. 12:41

19 THE WITNESS: I mean, I kind of saw it as the 12:41

20 other way around. Like, when we invested in Uber, 12:41

21 they knew well that we were doing self-driving cars, 12:41

22 and they decided to do that, so... 12:41

23 MR. GONZALEZ: Q. What makes you believe 12:41

24 that Uber knew, when you invested in Uber, that Google 12:41

25 was doing self-driving cars? 12:41

1	A	Because it was public information at the time	12:41
2		for a long time.	12:41
3	Q	For how long had that been public information	12:41
4		at the time that Google invested in Uber?	12:41
5	A	I don't know, but for a while; a long time, I	12:41
6		think.	12:41
7	Q	Why did Mr. Drummond step down from the Uber	12:41
8		board?	12:41
9	A	Well --	12:41
10	MR. VAN NEST:	Object to form of the	12:41
11		question.	12:41
12		You may answer it.	12:41
13	THE WITNESS:	Yeah, I'm not sure what	12:41
14		happened. He left the board. I think, you know,	12:41
15		obviously, there was more and more conflict there.	12:41
16	MR. GONZALEZ:	Q. Did you ever talk to	12:42
17		Mr. Drummond about whether or not he should continue	12:42
18		to serve on the Uber board?	12:42
19	MR. VAN NEST:	I'm going to object. That	12:42
20		probably calls for privileged information.	12:42
21		Don't disclose the content. He's just asking	12:42
22		you whether you had a discussion, yes or no.	12:42
23	THE WITNESS:	I mean, I remember being	12:42
24		informed that he was going to step down, and I	12:42
25		certainly didn't object to that.	12:42

1 MR. GONZALEZ: Q. Informed by who? 12:42

2 A I don't recall. 12:42

3 Q You say you didn't object. 12:42

4 Did anybody tell you why he was stepping 12:42

5 down? 12:42

6 A Well, I mean, I already testified I think the 12:42

7 conflict was clearly increasing. So, my recollection 12:42

8 of that was just there was more conflict and -- 12:42

9 Q What was the conflict that was increasing? 12:42

10 A I think it was clear that Uber was investing 12:42

11 heavily in self-driving technology, which we'd been 12:42

12 doing for a while already, and there was a lot of 12:42

13 conflict there. 12:42

14 Q When did you learn, for the first time, that 12:43

15 Anthony Levandowski was leaving Google? 12:43

16 A I mean, the first that I became aware of it 12:43

17 was when I got the e-mail from him. Even then, I was 12:43

18 a bit surprised. 12:43

19 Q Did you talk to him about it? 12:43

20 A I don't recall talking to him about it once 12:43

21 I'd gotten that e-mail, no. 12:43

22 Q Did you make any effort to retain him? 12:43

23 A Yeah, I delegated that. 12:43

24 Q To who? 12:43

25 A I don't remember exactly, but I'm assuming, 12:43

1	like, John, the CEO of Waymo.	12:43
2	Q That would be Krafcik?	12:43
3	A Krafcik.	12:43
4	Q Did Mr. Krafcik ever report to you on what he	12:43
5	did to follow up on your delegation?	12:44
6	A I mean, I think definitely he did, yeah. But	12:44
7	I think -- anyway, my -- my recollection is that, you	12:44
8	know, he had -- he had left basically that day, the	12:44
9	next day.	12:44
10	Q Do you recall that a year or so before	12:44
11	Mr. Levandowski left, he announced that he was going	12:44
12	to leave?	12:44
13	A I mean, I wish I had a penny for every time	12:44
14	employees do that and don't go. It happens pretty	12:44
15	often.	12:44
16	Q Do you recall that Mr. Levandowski had	12:44
17	announced that he was leaving about a year before he	12:44
18	actually left?	12:44
19	A No, sorry, I don't recall that.	12:44
20	Q Do you recall that there was conflict between	12:44
21	Anthony and Chris Urmson?	12:44
22	A Yes.	12:44
23	Q What do you recall about that conflict?	12:45
24	A I mean, it was pretty bad.	12:45
25	Q Can you elaborate on what you mean by that?	12:45

1 A I think they had a really hard time getting 12:45
2 along, and yet they worked together for a long time. 12:45
3 And it was a constant -- yeah, constant management 12:45
4 headache to help them get through that. 12:45
5 Q Do you recall that Anthony Levandowski was 12:45
6 put on a personal improvement plan before he left? 12:45
7 A I don't recall that. 12:45
8 Q Do you recall that Mr. Levandowski wanted to 12:45
9 be head of the Project Chauffeur team? 12:45
10 A I mean, that does not surprise me. 12:45
11 Q Do you recall having conversations with him, 12:45
12 where he said to you that he wanted to be head of the 12:45
13 team? 12:45
14 A I don't recall, but it wouldn't be 12:45
15 surprising, you know. I think he clearly felt things 12:45
16 could be done better. 12:45
17 Q Is there anybody who worked on Project 12:46
18 Chauffeur that you believe contributed more to that 12:46
19 project than Anthony Levandowski? 12:46
20 MR. VAN NEST: Objection; form; asked and 12:46
21 answered. 12:46
22 THE WITNESS: Yeah, I mean, positively or 12:46
23 negatively? 12:46
24 MR. GONZALEZ: In a positive way. 12:46
25 Q Did anybody contribute more in a positive way 12:46

1 to Project Chauffeur, in your view, than Anthony 12:46
2 Levandowski? 12:46
3 A I -- 12:46
4 MR. VAN NEST: Object to form. 12:46
5 THE WITNESS: All right. I'm not sure. 12:46
6 I mean, Chris -- Chris, for example, like, 12:46
7 was CEO of the project for a long time, and I think 12:46
8 had various significant contributions as the leader. 12:46
9 There's many technical contributors. 12:46
10 I'm not an expert on that question. 12:46
11 MR. GONZALEZ: Q. Do you think that 12:46
12 Mr. Urmson, Chris Urmson, contributed more than 12:46
13 Anthony to Project Chauffeur? 12:46
14 A I mean, I've already stated I believe 12:46
15 Anthony's contributions are quite possibly negative of 12:47
16 a high amount, so -- 12:47
17 Q What -- what do you mean by that? 12:47
18 Are you saying that Anthony Levandowski's 12:47
19 contribution to Project Chauffeur was negative? 12:47
20 A That's quite likely, I think. 12:47
21 Q And yet the company paid him \$120 million for 12:47
22 his negative contribution? 12:47
23 A No, absolutely not. I think, you know, not 12:47
24 all compensation you make in a start-up is based on 12:47
25 contribution. I think it's based on when we put that 12:47

1 plan in place, we caused a very good outcome. It, you 12:47
2 know, more or less revolutionized an industry. 12:47
3 Q So what -- I'm sorry. I didn't mean to cut 12:47
4 you off. Were you -- 12:47
5 A So, I think that plan -- you have to think 12:47
6 about the plan when it was put in place, not when it 12:47
7 was awarded. 12:47
8 Q What leads you to believe that Anthony 12:47
9 Levandowski's contribution to Project Chauffeur was 12:47
10 negative? 12:47
11 A Well, I mean, I think it's quite possible 12:47
12 that he did things that are very bad. I think he very 12:47
13 negatively affected morale probably as a result, and 12:48
14 many other things. But I think that's more clear now 12:48
15 than it was then. 12:48
16 Q What about his -- aside from morale of the 12:48
17 employees, what about his contributions just to the 12:48
18 autonomous vehicle that you were trying to develop? 12:48
19 Do you think his contributions to the 12:48
20 autonomous vehicle were positive or negative? 12:48
21 A You know, again, I'm not an expert on that. 12:48
22 And I imagine it depends on your perspective. 12:48
23 Q What is your perspective? 12:48
24 A I already told you my perspective. I'm not 12:48
25 sure. I think it could be significantly negative. 12:48

1 Now, to be -- he also obviously has done 12:48
2 technical work in other things, too. And I'm not an 12:48
3 expert on that. 12:48
4 Q When did you learn for the first time that 12:48
5 Mr. Levandowski may have taken Google information with 12:48
6 him when he left? 12:49
7 A I'm not sure of the exact time I learned 12:49
8 that. 12:49
9 Q Do you recall generally? 12:49
10 A I mean, I'm -- if you give me some context, 12:49
11 I'm sure I can figure that out. 12:49
12 Q Well, he left in January of 2016. I'm not 12:49
13 sure -- 12:49
14 A Okay. I wasn't aware of that when he left, 12:49
15 if that's your question. 12:49
16 Q At what point did you become aware that he 12:49
17 may have taken information that you believe belonged 12:49
18 to Google? 12:49
19 MR. VAN NEST: I want to caution you, 12:49
20 Mr. Page, not to disclose privileged communications. 12:49
21 Don't talk about anything you learned from a lawyer. 12:49
22 He's just asking about timing now. That's 12:49
23 all he wants to know, if you can recall. 12:49
24 THE WITNESS: Yeah, I don't recall. 12:49
25 MR. GONZALEZ: Q. You don't recall even 12:49

1 generally the date? 12:49

2 A No. 12:49

3 Q Or how you found out? 12:49

4 A I don't recall. 12:49

5 But, I think it would be very unusual for 12:49

6 that not to happen through a privileged exchange of 12:49

7 some sort. 12:49

8 Q Okay. But, sitting here today, you don't 12:50

9 recall the moment when you learned that 12:50

10 Mr. Levandowski may have taken information from 12:50

11 Google; is that right? 12:50

12 A Yeah, I don't remember when that happened. 12:50

13 Q Or how? 12:50

14 A I think I was informed of it somehow by a 12:50

15 person, but I don't -- I don't remember how. 12:50

16 Q All right. 12:50

17 Do you remember who the person was? 12:50

18 A No, I don't remember. 12:50

19 Q What was it that you understood 12:50

20 Mr. Levandowski took? 12:50

21 MR. VAN NEST: Well, I'll -- I'll object. 12:50

22 Don't disclose the content of any privileged 12:50

23 discussion with a lawyer. If you learned that from 12:50

24 someone other than a lawyer, you can testify about it. 12:50

25 But otherwise -- 12:50

1 THE WITNESS: Yeah, I don't remember. It was 12:50
2 hard to miss some of the headlines, though. But I 12:50
3 don't know how I learned that, though. 12:50
4 MR. GONZALEZ: All right. 12:50
5 Q You've made it clear you don't recall how you 12:50
6 learned it. 12:50
7 My question is: When you learned that he 12:50
8 took something, allegedly, what is it that you 12:50
9 understood that he took? 12:51
10 A I don't -- 12:51
11 MR. VAN NEST: Again, Mr. Page, I'm going 12:51
12 to -- if that information was provided to you by a 12:51
13 lawyer, then I'm instructing you not to answer. 12:51
14 THE WITNESS: Okay. 12:51
15 Yeah, I don't recall. 12:51
16 MR. GONZALEZ: Q. So, sitting here today, 12:51
17 you don't remember when you learned, what you learned, 12:51
18 or from who you learned what Mr. Levandowski allegedly 12:51
19 took from Google; is that right? 12:51
20 A That's correct. 12:51
21 Q Were you concerned when you learned that 12:51
22 Mr. Levandowski may have taken Google information? 12:51
23 A Of course. 12:51
24 Q Did you ever consider just calling 12:51
25 Mr. Levandowski and asking him whether he took 12:51

1 anything from Google? 12:51

2 A No, I did not consider that. 12:51

3 Q You -- you had his personal cell phone 12:51

4 number; right? 12:51

5 A I don't -- I don't think so. 12:51

6 Q You don't remember calling Mr. Levandowski on 12:51

7 his personal cell phone? 12:51

8 A No. It's possible, though. I don't remember 12:52

9 everyone that I call. 12:52

10 Q When did you first learn that Mr. Levandowski 12:52

11 may have solicited people from Google or Waymo? 12:52

12 MR. VAN NEST: Again, Mr. Page, caution as to 12:52

13 the content of any discussion with lawyers. 12:52

14 You can answer as to time, if you can recall. 12:52

15 THE WITNESS: Yeah, I can't -- I don't recall 12:52

16 that. 12:52

17 MR. GONZALEZ: Q. Do you recall how you 12:52

18 found out that Mr. Levandowski may have solicited 12:52

19 Waymo or Google employees? 12:52

20 A No, I don't recall. I think there are 12:52

21 probably some e-mails, but I don't recall them. 12:52

22 Q Do you recall of any employee that 12:52

23 Mr. Levandowski allegedly solicited? 12:52

24 A No. 12:53

25 Q When did you first learn that Uber had 12:53

1 allegedly done something wrong in connection with 12:53
2 Google or Waymo? 12:53
3 A I don't recall. 12:53
4 Q Do you recall how it came to your attention? 12:53
5 A No, I don't recall. 12:53
6 Q Sitting here today, what is it that you 12:53
7 understand Uber did that led to them being sued by 12:53
8 Waymo? 12:53
9 MR. VAN NEST: Again, Mr. Page, don't divulge 12:53
10 the content of any discussion with lawyers. 12:53
11 If you have information for counsel outside 12:53
12 of that, please provide it. 12:53
13 THE WITNESS: I mean, I can read the 12:53
14 progress, I guess, of the court case. Obviously, 12:53
15 there's trade secret, and there's also a poaching that 12:53
16 went on that's subject to the arbitration. There's 12:53
17 trade secret and a set of e-mails and so on. 12:53
18 MR. GONZALEZ: Q. Do you understand that 12:54
19 Waymo sued Uber for infringing on patents? 12:54
20 A I'm aware that's part of the lawsuit. 12:54
21 Q Are you aware of the fact that Waymo has 12:54
22 dismissed three of the four patents? 12:54
23 A I mean, I've read that in the press, yes. 12:54
24 Q What is the patent that is left in the case, 12:54
25 as you understand it? 12:54

Page 53

1 Q And you don't remember how you learned? 12:55

2 A I mean, that's correct, yes. 12:55

3 Q Whenever you learned that Uber may have 12:55

4 done -- well, strike that. 12:55

5 Did you authorize the filing of the lawsuit 12:55

6 against Uber? 12:55

7 A I mean, I'm certainly aware of it, yeah, and 12:55

8 then allowed it to proceed, I suppose. I'm not sure I 12:56

9 authorized it. I'm not sure that's the right word. 12:56

10 Q Well, could a lawsuit of this magnitude be 12:56

11 filed without your consent and approval? 12:56

12 A I mean, I guess I'm not -- I'm the CEO of the 12:56

13 company -- parent company of Waymo, and Waymo operates 12:56

14 more or less as an independent company. 12:56

15 Q Can Way- -- is Waymo authorized to file a 12:56

16 lawsuit like this on its own without even consulting 12:56

17 you? 12:56

18 A I mean, I don't know all the details of that. 12:56

19 Q Well, you're the boss. 12:56

20 What -- what is your state of mind? 12:56

21 Do you believe that Waymo is authorized to 12:56

22 file a lawsuit like this without giving you notice? 12:56

23 MR. VAN NEST: Object to form. 12:56

24 THE WITNESS: I mean -- 12:56

25 MR. GONZALEZ: I'll restate it. Let me -- 12:56

1 let me restate it, sir. 12:56

2 Q Do you believe that Waymo is authorized to 12:56

3 file a lawsuit like this without giving you notice? 12:56

4 MR. VAN NEST: Object to form. 12:56

5 THE WITNESS: I mean, I've already testified 12:56

6 that I was notified. 12:56

7 MR. GONZALEZ: You were notified, but my 12:56

8 question is slightly different. 12:57

9 Q Do you believe that Waymo could authorize the 12:57

10 filing of this lawsuit without notifying you? 12:57

11 A I mean, I don't know the answer to that. 12:57

12 Q When you learned that a lawsuit was going to 12:57

13 be filed against Uber, did you consider [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] 12:57

1 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
2 [REDACTED] 12:57
3 MR. VAN NEST: Again, Mr. Page, I want to 12:57
4 caution you not to disclose the content of the 12:57
5 discussions with lawyers. 12:57
6 THE WITNESS: Yeah. Then I guess my 12:58
7 recollection is a little hazy with regards to the 12:58
8 different things. There's an arbitration and there's 12:58
9 a lawsuit and so on. 12:58
10 MR. GONZALEZ: Right. 12:58
11 Q So, I'm focusing on the lawsuit against Uber. 12:58
12 A Well, the -- yeah, I don't even know... 12:58
13 MR. VAN NEST: Again -- again, don't disclose 12:58
14 the content of an attorney discussion. 12:58
15 THE WITNESS: Okay. 12:58
16 MR. GONZALEZ: It sounds like you may not 12:58
17 remember such a discussion. 12:58
18 Q And so I'm just trying to find out -- 12:58
19 MR. VAN NEST: You -- you can answer a 12:58
20 question about your memory, if that's what counsel 12:58
21 wants to ask. 12:58
22 MR. GONZALEZ: Q. Do you recall [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
23 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
24 [REDACTED] ? 12:58
25 A Look, I don't -- like, I don't recollect 12:58

1 the -- you know, exactly what happened. [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] 12:59
8 MR. VAN NEST: Just answer as to your 12:59
9 recollection, not what was said or not said, please. 12:59
10 THE WITNESS: Yeah, I don't recall that. 12:59
11 MR. GONZALEZ: Q. When did Google start 12:59
12 speaking with Lyft about the possibility of having 12:59
13 some kind of a joint venture with them? 12:59
14 A I mean, I'm not familiar with the details. 12:59
15 You know, I am not sure when we started talking to 12:59
16 them. 12:59
17 Q You understand that you now have an agreement 12:59
18 with Lyft; correct? 12:59
19 A Yeah, we have an announced agreement with 12:59
20 Lyft. 12:59
21 Q And who is the person at Google, Alphabet, or 12:59
22 Waymo, whichever entity it was, who was in charge of 12:59
23 those negotiations or discussions with Lyft? 12:59
24 A Mainly, that fell -- produced squarely under 12:59
25 John Krafcik, CEO of Waymo. I mean, we may have other 12:59

Page 57

1 deals with Lyft. The one you're talking about is with 13:00

2 Waymo, not with Google. 13:00

3 Q And what's the general substance, as you 13:00

4 understand it, of that agreement? 13:00

5 A I think the agreement basically provides for 13:00

6 some cooperation between Waymo and Lyft. 13:00

7 Q What type of -- I'm sorry -- what type of 13:00

8 cooperation? 13:00

9 A [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] 13:00

12 Q How long is the agreement for? 13:00

13 A Oh, I don't know. I don't know. 13:00

14 Q [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] 13:00

16 [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] 13:00

19 MR. PERLSON: Let me just note for the record 13:00

20 that there is a pending motion for protective order in 13:00

21 relation to Lyft. We're not going to cut off 13:00

22 questions now, but there may be further objections in 13:00

23 dealing with what was on the record on that. But we 13:01

24 can deal with that later. 13:01

25 MR. GONZALEZ: Q. [REDACTED] 13:01

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

1 [REDACTED] 13:01

2 MR. VAN NEST: Object to form. 13:01

3 THE WITNESS: Again, I'm not, like, expert on 13:01

4 that. [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

5 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

6 [REDACTED] 13:01

7 MR. GONZALEZ: Q. [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

8 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

9 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

10 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

11 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

12 [REDACTED] 13:01

13 Q Can you think of any other component? 13:01

14 A I mean, there's many other things you could 13:01

15 do. [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

16 [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

17 [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

18 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

19 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

20 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

21 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

22 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

23 Is that what you meant? 13:02

24 MR. VAN NEST: Object to form. 13:02

25 THE WITNESS: Yeah, I'm not sure what you 13:02

Page 59

1 mean by that, but... 13:02

2 MR. GONZALEZ: Q. I was just trying to 13:02

3 understand what you meant when you said [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

4 [REDACTED] 13:02

5 A All right. 13:02

6 So the question? 13:02

7 Q What did you mean by that? 13:02

8 A Yeah, like, [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

9 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

10 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

11 [REDACTED] [REDACTED] 13:02

12 MR. VAN NEST: Object to form. 13:02

13 THE WITNESS: Yeah, I'm not sure exactly what 13:02

14 we do in that case. 13:02

15 MR. GONZALEZ: Q. Did you play any role in 13:02

16 the discussions with Lyft? 13:03

17 A I mean, I was aware of them. I'm not sure 13:03

18 what feedback I gave, if any. 13:03

19 Q How were you aware of them? 13:03

20 A I periodically speak with John Krafcik, who 13:03

21 runs Waymo. 13:03

22 Q Do you remember how many times you spoke to 13:03

23 him about the Lyft agreement? 13:03

24 A I do not. 13:03

25 Q Let me ask you a couple of questions about 13:03

1 side businesses. 13:03

2 You understand that there are a number of 13:03

3 Google employees who have side businesses while 13:03

4 they're employed by Google; correct? 13:03

5 A I mean, I'm not -- I don't, like, get a 13:03

6 report on that or anything, but -- 13:04

7 Q But just generally, you're aware of the fact 13:04

8 that many of your colleagues at Google also have side 13:04

9 businesses; correct? 13:04

10 MR. VAN NEST: Object to form. 13:04

11 THE WITNESS: I mean, I think that's pretty 13:04

12 unusual. 13:04

13 MR. GONZALEZ: Q. What is unusual? 13:04

14 A I mean, side businesses are fairly unusual. 13:04

15 I don't -- I mean, you're saying many of my 13:04

16 colleagues. I don't -- I object to that, I guess. 13:04

17 Q Are you aware that some of your colleagues at 13:04

18 Google have side businesses? 13:04

19 MR. VAN NEST: Object to form. 13:04

20 THE WITNESS: I mean, I'm not sure which ones 13:04

21 you mean. Colleagues -- you mean some employees at 13:04

22 Google? 13:04

23 MR. GONZALEZ: Yes. 13:04

24 THE WITNESS: I mean... 13:04

25 MR. GONZALEZ: Q. Can you think of any 13:04

1 employees at Google who have side businesses, other 13:04
2 than [REDACTED]? 13:04
3 A I've already stated it's pretty unusual. I 13:04
4 think it's pretty normal for people to invest in other 13:05
5 companies. So very many people have investments, 13:05
6 which I would, you know, characterize those more as 13:05
7 investments, I guess. 13:05
8 I think -- so I think side businesses 13:05
9 themselves would be pretty unusual. I can't think of 13:05
10 a lot of examples of that, or any, actually, at the 13:05
11 moment. 13:05
12 Q Can you think of any side businesses that 13:05
13 Brian McClendon has? 13:05
14 A No. He's no longer an employee with us. 13:05
15 Q Is there any restriction at Google with 13:05
16 respect to where your employees can invest their 13:05
17 money? 13:05
18 A I mean, there's -- you know, there is a lot 13:05
19 of complex legal concerns and so on. So, I'm sure 13:05
20 there are some restrictions, yes -- 13:05
21 Q You don't -- 13:05
22 A -- in some reporting. 13:06
23 Q Do you know what they are? 13:06
24 A I don't know what all of them are, no. 13:06
25 Q For example, are your employees allowed to 13:06

1 invest in other companies that are working on 13:06
2 self-driving vehicles? 13:06
3 A I don't know the answer to that. 13:06
4 Q You understand that Mr. Levandowski, while he 13:06
5 worked at Google, had side businesses, one called 13:06
6 Anthony's Robots and one called 510 Systems; correct? 13:06
7 A I mean, I was aware that we bought some 13:06
8 companies from Anthony in the early days. 13:06
9 Q Did you understand that those companies were 13:06
10 involved with autonomous driving? 13:06
11 A I don't remember what the companies were 13:06
12 involved in. 13:06
13 Q You don't remember anything about what the 13:06
14 companies did? 13:06
15 A No. I mean, I remember them. You know, 13:06
16 they're some relation to Anthony, and he had some 13:06
17 companies. And he generally worked on self-driving, 13:06
18 but I don't know the details of that. 13:06
19 Q Did you agree with the decision to buy the 13:07
20 companies? 13:07
21 A I mean, that was a long time ago. I 13:07
22 certainly think I was somewhat involved in that and, 13:07
23 you know, approved it or whatever. 13:07
24 Q Do you have any recollection as to what the 13:07
25 purchase price was? 13:07

Page 64

1 Are you generally familiar with this 13:08
2 document? 13:08
3 A I mean, I don't recall having seen this 13:08
4 document. 13:08
5 Q If you'll look at the page '26164. It's 13:09
6 Exhibit A. I think you're very close to it. 13:09
7 A Oh, towards the back, you're saying? 13:09
8 Q Yes. It's Exhibit A, '26164. 13:09
9 Do you see the numbers on the bottom right 13:09
10 where your hand is, the numbers? 13:09
11 A Yep. 13:09
12 Q There you go. 13:09
13 A (Witness complies.) 13:09
14 Okay. 13:09
15 Q Do you recall that [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] I don't know 13:09
21 that I was aware of it then. 13:09
22 Q [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] 13:09
25 MR. VAN NEST: Object to form. 13:09

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

1 THE WITNESS: Yeah, I don't -- I don't 13:09

2 recall. 13:10

3 MR. GONZALEZ: Q. Do you recall [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED] 13:10

10 A I mean, certainly -- I'm sure we know the 13:10

11 answers to this, so, I mean, I don't -- 13:10

12 MR. VAN NEST: Wait -- wait for -- 13:10

13 THE WITNESS: -- I'm not an expert. 13:10

14 MR. VAN NEST: -- wait for his question, 13:10

15 Mr. Page. 13:10

16 THE WITNESS: Yeah. 13:10

17 MR. GONZALEZ: Q. Do you recall [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED] My question is somewhat 13:10

25 different. 13:10

Page 66

1 A I know. I don't know. 13:10

2 Q Let me try it again, and then you can give 13:10

3 that answer. 13:10

4 Do you know [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED] 13:10

8 MR. VAN NEST: Object to form. 13:10

9 THE WITNESS: I don't know. 13:10

10 But honestly, you know, Anthony had a larger 13:11

11 role in 2011 than he did later. So his payouts may -- 13:11

12 under this plan might have been higher than it 13:11

13 otherwise would have been, which happens in start-ups, 13:11

14 too. 13:11

15 MR. GONZALEZ: Q. What do you mean when you 13:11

16 say he "had a larger role in 2011 than he did later"? 13:11

17 What was the larger role that he had in 2011 13:11

18 that you think he didn't have later? 13:11

19 A I think he was, like, more in charge of the 13:11

20 project. Like, I don't remember exactly. It was a -- 13:11

21 I think he had a larger leadership role. 13:11

22 Q Was there anything in particular that he did 13:11

23 in his leadership role in 2011 that you believe he 13:11

24 didn't do in later years? 13:11

25 A I think he probably had greater 13:11

1 responsibility at that time. 13:11

2 Q Is there anything in particular that comes to 13:11

3 mind that he had in terms of a responsibility in 2011 13:11

4 that you believe he didn't have later? 13:11

5 A I mean, my -- you know, my recollection is 13:11

6 kind of hazy again. But, you know, at some point -- 13:11

7 and I don't know if 2011 -- but, at some point in 13:12

8 time, I think he was, like, more in charge of the 13:12

9 team. 13:12

10 Q And when you say "more in charge of the 13:12

11 team," is there anything specific that you believe he 13:12

12 was doing in 2011 to be in charge of the team that he 13:12

13 didn't do later? 13:12

14 A He did -- I'm not speaking about what he did. 13:12

15 I'm speaking about his responsibility. 13:12

16 Q Is there any particular responsibility that 13:12

17 comes to mind, that he had in 2011, that you believe 13:12

18 he did not have later? 13:12

19 A Well, I've already stated I think he had more 13:12

20 responsibility earlier than he did later, so for more 13:12

21 people or more groups, but I don't remember the detail 13:12

22 of it. 13:12

23 Q Can you remember any more specifically, than 13:12

24 what you just said, what the additional 13:12

25 responsibilities were that you believe Mr. Levandowski 13:12

1 had in 2011, but that you believe he did not have 13:12
2 later? 13:12
3 A My understanding in the early days is, he was 13:12
4 responsible for most of the team. You know, there's 13:12
5 some relationship with Sebastian, too. He was pretty 13:12
6 expert. I don't know exactly. And he, over time, got 13:12
7 more responsibility from more areas. I don't remember 13:12
8 that exactly. 13:13
9 I think that, over time, he got -- he got 13:13
10 sort of a more limited responsibility with respect to 13:13
11 hardware or -- or LiDAR or so on, and then had a -- as 13:13
12 I already mentioned, a fractious relationship with 13:13
13 Chris, who was then CEO. 13:13
14 Q Was there anything other than -- 13:13
15 A I'm not expert on any of that. There's many 13:13
16 people who understand it better than I do. 13:13
17 Q Was there anything, other than the 13:13
18 relationship with Chris, that you believe led to 13:13
19 Anthony Levandowski having a lesser role in later 13:13
20 years? 13:13
21 MR. VAN NEST: Object to form. 13:13
22 THE WITNESS: Yeah, I don't know. I don't 13:13
23 know how -- what all happened or whatever. I'm just 13:13
24 telling you, I think there was more responsibility 13:13
25 early on. 13:13

Page 70

Page 71

1 dealing with all these people who don't like me." 13:16

2 I mean, he's kind of a grumpy person 13:16

3 sometimes. And, you know, "Why don't I just go do a 13:16

4 company that does trucking? And everything will be 13:16

5 fine." 13:16

6 I'm, like, No, that's not fine. Like, that's 13:16

7 the same thing as what you're doing here. I mean, you 13:16

8 can do that, but we are not going to be happy. 13:16

9 Q I want to make sure that you finish the 13:16

10 conversation. 13:16

11 Have you now told me everything that you can 13:16

12 recall saying? 13:16

13 A I don't -- I don't know if that's all I can 13:16

14 recall, but that's the -- the gist of it, in my mind. 13:16

15 Q Is there anything else that you can recall? 13:16

16 A I now believe he was trying to get me to say 13:16

17 that it would not be competitive if he did trucking, 13:16

18 because he was already doing it. That's pretty clear 13:16

19 to me. 13:17

20 Q When is it that you had this conversation? 13:17

21 A Soon before he left. I don't remember 13:17

22 exactly when. 13:17

23 Q Did you ask him whether Google might be 13:17

24 interested, or did you say to him that Google might be 13:17

25 interested in trucking? 13:17

1 A Yeah. I mean, that's basically what I said. 13:17
2 Like -- but I think he was pretty clear he was just 13:17
3 trying to justify something that he'd already decided 13:17
4 to do. 13:17
5 Q So, what are the words that you recall saying 13:17
6 to him with respect to Google's interest in autonomous 13:17
7 trucking? 13:17
8 A Well, I think I don't remember my words. I 13:17
9 just was clear that we are -- we were obviously 13:17
10 interested in that area because it's the same thing, 13:17
11 basically. 13:17
12 Q So, Mr. Levandowski said something to you 13:17
13 about starting a new company dealing with autonomous 13:17
14 trucks and -- 13:17
15 A No. He speculated that he might do 13:17
16 something, and I was clearly negative on that. And 13:17
17 then he sort of dropped it at that. 13:17
18 Q Is there anything in writing about this, that 13:17
19 you are aware of? 13:18
20 A I'm not aware of anything in writing, but I'm 13:18
21 not sure it's that relevant. 13:18
22 Q Was anybody else present? 13:18
23 A I'm not sure. 13:18
24 Q Did you tell anybody about the conversation? 13:18
25 A I don't recall. But, I think it wouldn't 13:18

1 surprise me if other people were aware of those 13:18
2 general things. 13:18
3 Q At any point, did you tell anybody about the 13:18
4 conversation? 13:18
5 A I mean, I'd be surprised if I didn't, but I 13:18
6 don't recall what I did. 13:18
7 Q When did you learn that, in fact, 13:18
8 Mr. Levandowski was working on an autonomous trucking 13:18
9 project? 13:18
10 A I don't recall when I -- when that happened. 13:18
11 I think, you know, I got some e-mail or something, or 13:18
12 read about it in the press or -- 13:18
13 Q And what was your reaction? 13:18
14 A I was pretty angry about it or upset with 13:18
15 him. 13:18
16 Q Did you say anything to the person who 13:18
17 informed you of that? 13:18
18 A I don't recall. 13:18
19 Q At that moment, when you learned that 13:19
20 Mr. Levandowski was involved with autonomous trucking, 13:19
21 did you consider calling him and talking to him about 13:19
22 it? 13:19
23 A No, I didn't really consider that. 13:19
24 Q Did you think it was inappropriate for him to 13:19
25 do that? 13:19

1 but -- 13:20

2 MR. GONZALEZ: Q. Do you have any issues 13:20

3 with that yourself? 13:20

4 A I mean, I think it would be pretty unusual 13:20

5 for an employee to start operating on a new business 13:20

6 while they're working on their current business with 13:20

7 their employer, and that sounds highly unusual. 13:20

8 Q And, to be clear, that's not what I'm asking 13:20

9 about, operating any business. 13:20

10 I'm asking right now just about 13:20

11 communications, conversations. 13:20

12 A Well, conversations as Waymo, or 13:20

13 conversations as Anthony himself? 13:20

14 Q As Anthony himself. 13:20

15 Let me rephrase the question. 13:20

16 A I'm not a lawyer. 13:20

17 Q I just want to know what you believe. You're 13:20

18 not -- you're not a lawyer, but you're the CEO of the 13:20

19 company. 13:20

20 In your view, as CEO of the company, are 13:20

21 employees allowed to have conversations with third 13:20

22 parties about start-ups that they might want to form? 13:21

23 MR. VAN NEST: Objection to form. 13:21

24 THE WITNESS: If I was asked that question, I 13:21

25 would ask my lawyer, and I'd have them talk to them. 13:21

1 MR. GONZALEZ: Q. You don't have an opinion, 13:21
2 one way or the other, sitting here today, as to 13:21
3 whether your employees can do that? 13:21
4 MR. VAN NEST: Object to form. 13:21
5 THE WITNESS: So, it sounds to me like a 13:21
6 legal question. 13:21
7 MR. GONZALEZ: Q. It may also be a business 13:21
8 question; right? 13:21
9 So, I'm asking you from the business side. 13:21
10 Is there anything at Google, any policy that 13:21
11 you're aware of, that prevents employees from talking 13:21
12 to third parties about the possibility of doing a 13:21
13 start-up? 13:21
14 MR. VAN NEST: Objection. It's vague. 13:21
15 THE WITNESS: I mean, a start-up, that's, you 13:21
16 know, exactly what you're currently doing, or 13:21
17 something else, or depending on whether we bought your 13:21
18 company or not, or many other things. 13:21
19 I don't know. That's a complicated question, 13:21
20 and I generally would ask my attorney that question to 13:21
21 look at that. 13:21
22 MR. GONZALEZ: Q. Are you generally aware of 13:22
23 the policies of Google? 13:22
24 A I mean, there's a lot of policies. 13:22
25 Q Understood. 13:22

1 Are you generally aware of the policies at 13:22
2 Google that deal with employees starting up their own 13:22
3 companies? 13:22
4 A I wouldn't say I'm generally aware of that. 13:22
5 I don't think that comes into practice very often. 13:22
6 Q Are you aware of any situation where an 13:22
7 employee has wanted to start up a new company, and 13:22
8 Google said to that employee, You can't do it? 13:22
9 A I mean, those exact quotes? 13:22
10 Q Or words to that effect. 13:22
11 A I mean, I'm not aware of that. 13:22
12 Q So, let me ask you about Anthony. 13:22
13 A Yeah. 13:22
14 Q Not a hypothetical, but about -- about 13:22
15 Anthony Levandowski. 13:22
16 If, after having this conversation with you 13:22
17 about trucking -- you say it was shortly before he 13:22
18 left. 13:23
19 If that same day Mr. Levandowski had called 13:23
20 General Motors and said, "Hey, I've got an idea about 13:23
21 autonomous trucking. Maybe we can ship stuff on 13:23
22 trucks without drivers," in your view, would that have 13:23
23 been a violation of some Google policy? 13:23
24 MR. VAN NEST: Object to form. 13:23
25 THE WITNESS: I don't know. 13:23

1 MR. GONZALEZ: Q. There isn't any policy in 13:23
2 particular that jumps out at you that says, Oh, no, 13:23
3 you can't do that? 13:23
4 A I mean, I don't know. I mean, I think it's a 13:23
5 complicated area. 13:23
6 MR. VAN NEST: Counsel, when you get to a 13:23
7 convenient spot, let's -- 13:23
8 MR. GONZALEZ: Let's go off the record. 13:23
9 MR. VAN NEST: -- take a short break. 13:23
10 MR. GONZALEZ: Let's go off the record. 13:23
11 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are off the record at 13:23
12 1:24 p.m. 13:23
13 (Recess taken.) 13:23
14 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the record 13:38
15 at 1:38 p.m. 13:38
16 MR. GONZALEZ: Q. Sir, is this litigation 13:38
17 important to you? 13:38
18 MR. VAN NEST: Object to form. 13:38
19 THE WITNESS: Yeah, I'm not sure which 13:38
20 litigation you're referring to. But generally, the 13:38
21 case here -- cases, I suppose. 13:38
22 MR. GONZALEZ: I'm asking you specifically 13:38
23 about the litigation that Waymo has brought against 13:38
24 Uber. 13:38
25 Q Is that litigation important to you? 13:38

1 A I mean, in some ways, I would say yes; in 13:39
2 some ways, no. 13:39
3 I mean, I think however many years we've been 13:39
4 running Google/Alphabet, we've never had to bring a 13:39
5 case like this before, which is, you know, a lot of 13:39
6 years and a lot of employees. 13:39
7 On the other hand, the scale of our business, 13:39
8 it's not -- you know, we have a very large business. 13:39
9 Q So, when you say in some ways, yes, it's 13:39
10 important, what do you mean by that? 13:39
11 A Well, I think if somebody has likely done 13:39
12 something wrong, that it's probably important to -- 13:39
13 to -- to pay attention to that. 13:39
14 Q And what is it that makes you think that Uber 13:39
15 may have done something wrong? 13:39
16 MR. VAN NEST: Again, object to any 13:39
17 discussion of communications you've had with lawyers. 13:39
18 If you have some information outside of that, 13:40
19 you may answer. 13:40
20 THE WITNESS: I mean, I think we're still in 13:40
21 the early stages of that -- of knowing the answers to 13:40
22 those questions, and I expect we'll get much better 13:40
23 ones. 13:40
24 MR. GONZALEZ: Q. Well, sitting here today, 13:40
25 separate and apart from what your lawyers may have 13:40

1 told you, what is your understanding of what Uber did 13:40
2 that led to them being sued? 13:40
3 A Well, I mean, I think that Otto, the company, 13:40
4 obviously, in my understanding, there is a poaching 13:40
5 claim. There is a trade secret claim. There's files 13:40
6 that are at issue. There's knowledge of that 13:40
7 potentially by Uber at a pretty early stage. And then 13:40
8 there's a very large price paid to a company that 13:40
9 existed for a very short time in combination with 13:41
10 that. 13:41
11 That's, you know, I think the basic summary 13:41
12 people would give of the -- of the proceedings here. 13:41
13 Q You used the word "potentially," which is an 13:41
14 important word, at least in my mind. 13:41
15 When you say that, potentially, Uber knew at 13:41
16 a pretty early stage of some wrongdoing, what is the 13:41
17 specific wrongdoing that you believe Uber knew about? 13:41
18 MR. VAN NEST: Again, Mr. Page, do not 13:41
19 provide any communications you had with lawyers. 13:41
20 If you can answer outside that -- that's all 13:41
21 counsel is asking for -- you may answer him. 13:41
22 THE WITNESS: I mean, I can provide, like, a 13:41
23 summary of some of the press articles that I read, 13:41
24 which is probably not that interesting, as it's public 13:41
25 knowledge. 13:41

1 MR. GONZALEZ: And you read about that. I 13:41
2 mean, we all can read the papers. I -- and if you 13:41
3 don't know anything, that's fine. 13:41
4 Q I just need to know: Other than what your 13:41
5 lawyers may have told you, do you have any factual 13:41
6 basis for believing that, at an early point, Uber knew 13:42
7 there was something wrong? 13:42
8 A I mean, I guess the thing I'm referring to is 13:42
9 just some public information around the time in which 13:42
10 they knew maybe there was copied files, but I'm not an 13:42
11 expert on that. I just have seen some comments to 13:42
12 that effect. 13:42
13 I'm not talking a privileged communication 13:42
14 there. 13:42
15 Q Understood. 13:42
16 You're just talking about what you read in 13:42
17 the papers? 13:42
18 A Yeah. 13:42
19 Q Okay. Other than what you read in the 13:42
20 papers, you don't have any personal knowledge; is that 13:42
21 fair? 13:42
22 A No. 13:42
23 Q "No" meaning it is fair? 13:42
24 A I'd say other than that and privileged 13:42
25 communication. 13:42

1 MR. GONZALEZ: Let me show you a document 13:42
2 that we've marked as Exhibit 1088. 13:42
3 (Document marked Exhibit 1088 13:42
4 for identification.) 13:42
5 MR. VAN NEST: Thank you. 13:42
6 MR. GONZALEZ: For the record, this is an 13:42
7 e-mail chain. The top of the first page is an e-mail 13:42
8 from Mr. Page, dated December 6th, 2010. It has Bates 13:43
9 stamp Nos. '26138 through '140. 13:43
10 Q I'm going to show you a series of documents. 13:43
11 And you obviously can read whatever you feel like you 13:43
12 need to read, but I'm going to ask you only some very 13:43
13 specific questions. And so, what I suggest is that 13:43
14 you look at what I'm asking you. And, if you feel you 13:43
15 need to read more, you can read as much as you feel. 13:43
16 A Okay. 13:43
17 Q This is an e-mail from you to David Lawee. 13:43
18 Did I pronounce that correctly? 13:43
19 A Yes. 13:43
20 Q Is Mr. Lawee still with your company? 13:43
21 A He is. 13:43
22 Q And what was his position at this time in 13:43
23 2010? 13:43
24 A I mean, I think in the context, I don't know 13:43
25 his exact position. But, [REDACTED] 13:43

1 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
2 [REDACTED] 13:43
3 And he went on to be business development and 13:43
4 investments. 13:43
5 Q The discussion in this e-mail is about [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
6 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
7 [REDACTED]. 13:44
8 Is that generally fair? 13:44
9 A I mean, I can look through it, if you'd like. 13:44
10 Q Sure. 13:44
11 And particularly, I'd call your attention to 13:44
12 the first page past the halfway point, the e-mail from 13:44
13 Mr. Lawee to you. He's talking about [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
14 [REDACTED]. 13:44
15 Do you see that? 13:44
16 A Yeah. 13:44
17 Q Does that refresh your recollection that [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
18 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
19 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
20 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
21 [REDACTED]? 13:44
22 A I mean, I guess I can read the e-mail. I'm 13:44
23 not sure that's -- are you saying that was our intent 13:44
24 or -- 13:45
25 Q Does that refresh your recollection that 13:45

1 that's where you ended up? 13:45

2 A No. 13:45

3 Q And then you wrote back and you said: 13:45

4 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

5 [REDACTED] 13:45

6 Do you see that? 13:45

7 A Yeah. 13:45

8 Q What do you mean by that, [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

9 [REDACTED]? 13:45

10 A I mean, we wanted to probably approximate 13:45

11 the -- what a start-up would do for some of the key 13:45

12 people. 13:45

13 Q And that was, in part, to encourage them to 13:45

14 stay; right? 13:45

15 A I mean, I've already testified that I think 13:45

16 you're getting them to stay, but also getting them to 13:45

17 really be vested in the outcome is maybe the more 13:45

18 important question. 13:45

19 Q And then you said, at the top e-mail [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

20 [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

21 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

22 [REDACTED] 13:45

23 Do you see that? 13:45

24 A Yeah, I saw that at the top. 13:45

25 Q [REDACTED] 13:45

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

1 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] 13:46
7 Q Right. 13:46
8 And the passengers that you're currently 13:46
9 giving rides to in Phoenix, [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]? 13:46
11 A [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] 13:46
13 Q Fair enough. 13:46
14 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] 13:46
19 Q You tell me. You're the CEO. My 13:46
20 understanding is that [REDACTED]. If I'm wrong, I'm 13:46
21 wrong. 13:46
22 A I'm not the CEO of Waymo. I'm the CEO of 13:46
23 Alphabet. 13:46
24 Q Fair enough. We'll -- we'll find out from 13:46
25 somebody else, but I think they're free. 13:46

Page 86

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

1 A Okay. 13:46

2 Q When you say [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

3 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

4 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

5 [REDACTED]? 13:47

6 A I guess I'm confused about the context of 13:47

7 that -- of this statement. Is that just -- I mean, it 13:47

8 has nothing to do with this document; no? 13:47

9 Q Tell me why you're separating the two. I -- 13:47

10 I thought that this document was a discussion that led 13:47

11 to -- 13:47

12 A Oh, I see what you're saying. I think they 13:47

13 just didn't do that. 13:47

14 Q [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

15 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

16 [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

17 [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

18 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

19 [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

20 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

21 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

22 [REDACTED] 13:47

23 MR. VAN NEST: Object to form. 13:47

24 THE WITNESS: I don't know what happens. I 13:47

25 mean, reading this, it's an interesting history. I 13:47

Page 87

25	Q Yes.	13:49
----	--------	-------

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

1 A Yeah, I mean, it says it's, like -- his name 13:49

2 is on here, and I think he was involved in that, yeah. 13:49

3 Q Do you recall what role he played? 13:49

4 A I mean, he was definitely one of the people 13:49

5 reviewing it and kind of in charge. I don't know the 13:49

6 exact role he played. 13:49

7 Q Do you recall telling Sebastian, [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

8 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

9 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

10 [REDACTED]? 13:49

11 A I don't recall that, no. 13:49

12 Q Do you recall telling him that, [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

13 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

14 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

15 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

16 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

17 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

18 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

19 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

20 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

21 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

22 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

23 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

24 [REDACTED] 13:50

25 MR. GONZALEZ: Let me show you Exhibit 1089. 13:50

Page 89

1 (Document marked Exhibit 1089 13:50
2 for identification.) 13:50
3 MR. GONZALEZ: For the record, this is a 13:50
4 two-page e-mail with Bates stamp WAYMO '26142 and 13:50
5 '143. 13:50
6 Q Sir, you are not part of this e-mail chain, 13:50
7 but I believe there's a reference in the chain to you 13:50
8 in the second e-mail from the top. 13:50
9 A Okay. 13:51
10 Q Actually, with re- -- with respect to the one 13:51
11 I just showed you, 1088, I forgot to ask you 13:51
12 something. 13:51
13 When is the last time that you've seen this 13:51
14 e-mail, 1088? 13:51
15 It's dated December 6th, 2010. 13:51
16 Have you seen it since then? 13:51
17 A I'm not sure how to answer that question. 13:51
18 MR. VAN NEST: Don't provide the information 13:51
19 about discussions with your lawyers. 13:51
20 He's asking about, have you seen it in the 13:51
21 course of business since that time? 13:51
22 THE WITNESS: I don't think so, no. 13:51
23 MR. GONZALEZ: Q. In preparing for your 13:51
24 deposition, did you review documents? 13:51
25 A Yeah. 13:51

1 Q And did those documents help refresh your 13:51
2 recollection about events that occurred many years 13:51
3 ago? 13:51
4 MR. VAN NEST: That's overbroad. I'll object 13:51
5 to the form of the question. 13:51
6 THE WITNESS: I mean, I'm sure that they 13:52
7 helped my recollection somewhat. 13:52
8 MR. GONZALEZ: Q. They helped refresh it 13:52
9 because these events are events that took place a long 13:52
10 time ago? 13:52
11 A Yeah. 13:52
12 Q And what specific documents helped refresh 13:52
13 your recollection? 13:52
14 A I don't recall. 13:52
15 Q Are these documents that were shown to you in 13:52
16 preparation for your deposition? 13:52
17 A Certainly not -- yes. 13:52
18 Q All right. 13:52
19 MR. GONZALEZ: Counsel, I think per 13:52
20 Judge Alsup's standing order, we're entitled to see 13:52
21 those documents. 13:52
22 MR. VAN NEST: I don't think so, Counsel, but 13:52
23 we can debate that at a later time. 13:52
24 MR. GONZALEZ: Okay. Fine. Fair enough. 13:52
25 Just so the record is clear. 13:52

1 MR. VAN NEST: I disagree, but -- 13:52

2 MR. GONZALEZ: So that the record is clear, 13:52

3 we're -- we're asking for them, and Counsel is 13:52

4 declining to provide them. 13:52

5 And I agree with you. We don't need to 13:52

6 debate the point now. 13:52

7 All right. Let me come back to my question. 13:52

8 Q I -- I -- is there any particular document 13:52

9 that comes to mind in terms of refreshing your 13:52

10 recollection? 13:52

11 Or, is it just the documents in general 13:53

12 refreshed your recollection? 13:53

13 MR. VAN NEST: Objection to form. 13:53

14 THE WITNESS: Nothing in particular. 13:53

15 MR. GONZALEZ: Q. This Document 1088, is 13:53

16 this one that refreshed your recollection in preparing 13:53

17 for the deposition? 13:53

18 A I mean, I think so. It's a long e-mail 13:53

19 thread, so I'm not sure. 13:53

20 Q Understood. 13:53

21 Before seeing this e-mail recently, did you 13:53

22 remember that you had suggested [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

23 [REDACTED]? 13:53

24 A No, I did not remember that. 13:53

25 Q All right. 13:53

1 Now, if we can please go to 1089. 13:53

2 A (Witness complies.) 13:53

3 Q First, you'll notice the e-mail from 13:53

4 Sebastian right about the halfway point of the first 13:53

5 page from 11:11 p.m. 13:53

6 Do you see that? 13:54

7 A Yes. 13:54

8 MR. VAN NEST: Take your time and review the 13:54

9 document, Mr. Page. 13:54

10 MR. GONZALEZ: It's actually right above the 13:54

11 redaction. There's one part of the document that's 13:54

12 redacted, that little black box. 13:54

13 Q Do you notice that right above that, it says: 13:54

14 "Anthony, [REDACTED]." 13:54

15 Do you see that? 13:54

16 A Yeah. 13:54

17 Q Does this refresh your recollection that, 13:54

18 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

19 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

20 [REDACTED]? 13:54

21 A I mean, I don't recall that. 13:54

22 Q And then it says -- right below the 13:54

23 redaction, it says: 13:54

24 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] 13:54

1 Do you see that? 13:54

2 A Yeah. 13:54

3 Q Does that refresh your recollection -- 13:54

4 recollection at all that [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

5 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

6 [REDACTED]? 13:55

7 A I mean, I don't recall it. I'm sure it's, 13:55

8 like, an actual document somewhere. 13:55

9 Q And then, if you go up the chain, is it 13:55

10 Sergey? Is that how you pronounce his name? 13:55

11 A Sergey. 13:55

12 Q Okay. Sergey writes -- he's your co-founder; 13:55

13 is that right? 13:55

14 A Yes. 13:55

15 Q You're good friends? 13:55

16 A Yes. 13:55

17 Q Sergey writes: 13:55

18 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

19 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

20 [REDACTED] 13:55

21 Do you see that? 13:55

22 A Yeah. 13:55

23 Q He's basically asking, [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

24 [REDACTED]? 13:55

25 A Is he -- is he asking me? 13:55

1 Q No, he's not asking you. I just want you to 13:55
2 follow the e-mail. 13:55
3 A Okay. 13:55
4 Q Is that your understanding, that he's asking, 13:55
5 [REDACTED]? 13:55
6 MR. VAN NEST: I'll object to the form. 13:55
7 THE WITNESS: The question -- 13:55
8 MR. VAN NEST: He -- he's never seen this. 13:55
9 MR. GONZALEZ: All right. 13:55
10 Q Let's go up the e-mail chain and get to the 13:55
11 part with your name. 13:56
12 Sebastian responds -- I just want to put the 13:56
13 context in. He responds to Mr. Brin, and it says, in 13:56
14 part: 13:56
15 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] 13:56
18 Do you see that? 13:56
19 A Yeah. 13:56
20 Q Do you agree that that's the directive that 13:56
21 you gave? 13:56
22 A I mean, I can't -- I wouldn't say it in that 13:56
23 way. But I think at the time, like, [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] 13:56

1 [REDACTED] 13:56

2 Q And, by the way, it says: 13:56

3 [REDACTED] 13:56

4 Do you believe that Chauffeur has succeeded? 13:56

5 A I mean, I think it's accomplished a lot. I 13:56

6 mean, I think, you know, that there's no doubt that 13:56

7 the whole industry has changed as a result, a large 13:56

8 industry. 13:56

9 Q As of the date that Mr. Levandowski left your 13:57

10 company in January of 2016, as of that date, did you 13:57

11 think that Chauffeur had succeeded? Would you agree 13:57

12 that it had? 13:57

13 A In the context of this document, which is 13:57

14 about [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] 13:57

1 A As I already stated, I think there are some 13:57
2 complicated things around that. 13:57

3 Q What is it that you're referring to when you 13:58
4 say -- I didn't intend to say anything controversial. 13:58

5 [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] 13:58

Page 98

1 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]
9 [REDACTED] 14:00
10 Q I'm sorry. I think I've asked you this, but 14:00
11 is David Lawee still with you? 14:00
12 A Yes, he is. He runs a different area now. 14:00
13 (Document marked Exhibit 1090 14:00
14 for identification.) 14:00
15 MR. GONZALEZ: Sir, let me show you a 14:00
16 document that we've marked as Exhibit 1090. 14:00
17 MR. VAN NEST: I got it. Thank you. 14:01
18 MR. GONZALEZ: For the record, it is a 14:01
19 two-page e-mail, with Bates stamp No. WAYMO '26144 and 14:01
20 '45. 14:01
21 Q Sir, this is an e-mail chain. The top e-mail 14:01
22 was sent to you by Laszlo Bock on July 9, 2011; 14:01
23 correct? 14:01
24 A Uh-huh. 14:01
25 Q Yes? 14:01

Page 100

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

1 that refresh your recollection that [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] ? 14:03
4 MR. VAN NEST: He's asking whether you now 14:03
5 remember that, after reviewing this. 14:03
6 THE WITNESS: No, I don't remember that. I 14:03
7 mean, I don't know if this is, like, the complete 14:03
8 thing also. I mean, this is -- 14:03
9 MR. GONZALEZ: I understand. This may simply 14:03
10 be a snapshot in time. I get that. I'm just trying 14:03
11 to see if it sparks a memory. 14:03
12 Q Right above that, it talks about [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] 14:04
16 Do you see that? 14:04
17 A Yeah. 14:04
18 Q Does that refresh your recollection that 14:04
19 [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] I just don't know myself. 14:04
24 Q All right. 14:04
25 The point of this e-mail is simply to show 14:04

1 that, even though you may not remember today, you were 14:04
2 involved in communications in 2011 about [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
3 [REDACTED]; is that fair? 14:04
4 MR. VAN NEST: Object to form. 14:04
5 THE WITNESS: I'm not sure how involved I am. 14:04
6 It seems like [REDACTED], and 14:04
7 I'm being informed. 14:04
8 MR. GONZALEZ: Q. Do you recall -- does this 14:04
9 refresh your recollection that, in 2011, [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
10 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
11 [REDACTED]? 14:04
12 MR. VAN NEST: He wants to know if you now 14:05
13 remember that. 14:05
14 THE WITNESS: No. 14:05
15 MR. VAN NEST: That's what he's asking. 14:05
16 THE WITNESS: I don't now remember that. I 14:05
17 believe I was on this e-mail. 14:05
18 MR. GONZALEZ: Whoops. Wrong one. 14:05
19 (Document marked Exhibit 1091 14:05
20 for identification.) 14:05
21 MR. GONZALEZ: Sir, let me show you a 14:05
22 document that we've marked as Exhibit 1091. It's a 14:05
23 one-page e-mail from Waymo with the Bates stamp 14:05
24 '11799. 14:05
25 MR. VAN NEST: Thank you. 14:05

1 MR. GONZALEZ: Q. Do you recall receiving 14:06
2 this e-mail from Mr. Levandowski on January 27, 2016? 14:06
3 A I mean, I think I clearly did receive this 14:06
4 e-mail, yes. 14:06
5 Q I'm sorry? 14:06
6 A I clearly received this e-mail, yes. 14:06
7 Q Do you remember it? 14:06
8 A I remember getting an e-mail like this, yes. 14:06
9 Q He says that he bumped into Sebastian, and 14:06
10 he's super happy at Udacity and kitty hawk. 14:06
11 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] 14:06
15 Q Then he says: 14:06
16 "There's just too much BS with Chris." 14:06
17 That's Mr. Urmson? 14:06
18 A Yes. 14:06
19 Q "JK, Brian." 14:06
20 Who did you understand that was referring to? 14:06
21 A That's John Krafcik and Bryan Salesky, I 14:06
22 assume. 14:07
23 Q You said earlier that, when you received the 14:07
24 e-mail, you don't recall responding to 14:07
25 Mr. Levandowski; is that right? 14:07

1 A Yeah, I don't recall responding. 14:07

2 Q You delegated that task to someone else. 14:07

3 What was your understanding as to what 14:07

4 Mr. Levandowski's relationship was -- was with John or 14:07

5 Bryan? Did you have an understanding? 14:07

6 MR. VAN NEST: Objection; form. It's 14:07

7 compound. 14:07

8 THE WITNESS: Sorry. Can you repeat it? 14:07

9 Sorry. 14:07

10 MR. GONZALEZ: Yeah. 14:07

11 Q You -- you indicated earlier that you were 14:07

12 aware that there was some tension between Anthony and 14:07

13 Chris. 14:07

14 Were you aware of any tension between Anthony 14:07

15 and Bryan? 14:07

16 A Anthony and Bryan. I'm just trying to think 14:07

17 about that. 14:07

18 I mean, yeah, I can't really recall. It 14:07

19 wouldn't be surprising, I think, but... 14:08

20 Q What about Anthony and John? 14:08

21 A There was definitely tension between Anthony 14:08

22 and John. 14:08

23 Q And -- and explain to me what you base that 14:08

24 on. 14:08

25 A Well, I mean, a couple of things. I mean, I 14:08

[illegible]

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

1

■

■

■

■

■

■

■

9

10

11

12

13

14

■

■

■

■

■

■

■

■

■

■

■

[REDACTED]

■

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

■

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

■

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

14:09

Q Did you consider appointing Mr. Levandowski

14:09

to the position that John got?

14:09

A I mean, I don't -- I don't remember seriously

14:10

considering that.

14:10

Q And why didn't you?

14:10

A I mean, I was, as I said, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

■

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

■

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

14:10

Page 106

1 [REDACTED] 14:10

2 Q Why did you think it made a lot of sense for 14:10

3 Mr. Levandowski to have a role around the hardware? 14:10

4 A I just think he had a lot of passion around 14:10

5 it and, you know, would probably move things forward. 14:10

6 But that was hardware, specifically build of a car -- 14:10

7 build of cars, which I felt like was an easier thing 14:11

8 to do maybe than the team thought, and I think Anthony 14:11

9 agreed with me about that. 14:11

10 Q What is it that made you believe that 14:11

11 Mr. Levandowski would be good at building the car? 14:11

12 A Well, I think he just had done that before. 14:11

13 So he built the -- not the car, but really, the 14:11

14 integration with the car. Building the car is not 14:11

15 really correct; taking a car that exists and 14:11

16 integrating the self-driving systems with it. He did 14:11

17 that before for us, so it was not a stretch. He was 14:11

18 involved in it. 14:11

19 Q Are autonomous vehicles important to Google? 14:11

20 A Well, I -- 14:11

21 MR. VAN NEST: Objection; form. 14:11

22 THE WITNESS: -- yeah, I guess -- 14:12

23 MR. VAN NEST: You may answer. 14:12

24 THE WITNESS: -- they're part of Alphabet, 14:12

25 not Google. 14:12

1 MR. GONZALEZ: All right. 14:12

2 Q Are autonomous vehicles important to 14:12

3 Alphabet? 14:12

4 A I mean, I think it's a scenario where, you 14:12

5 know, we're obviously investing a lot in. And then, 14:12

6 you know, it's one of the things we work pretty hard 14:12

7 on. 14:12

8 Q Why? 14:12

9 A I think a lot of people die on highways, and 14:12

10 I think people spend a lot of time driving. I think 14:12

11 it's an important area. 14:12

12 Q [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] 14:13

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

1 A [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] 14:13
4 Q Is Uber a competitor? 14:13
5 A I think it's pretty clear that Uber is a 14:13
6 competitor in the self-driving space. 14:13
7 Q When was that made clear to you? 14:13
8 A Well, I think just Travis started talking 14:13
9 about it, you know, like -- 14:13
10 Q When? 14:13
11 A I don't know. Whenever he started talking 14:13
12 about it in public, I think it was pretty clear. He 14:13
13 said, like, "We must do this, or our company will not 14:13
14 succeed." I think it's pretty foolish to assume 14:13
15 they're not a competitor at that point. 14:14
16 Q Did you ever have any discussions with 14:14
17 Mr. Kalanick about them being a competitor? 14:14
18 A I mean, I think from time to time we 14:14
19 discussed some things. [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] 14:14

Page 109

1 [REDACTED] 14:14

2 Q Do you remember when you told him that? 14:14

3 A No. I mean, I've had a few conversations 14:14

4 over the years. I don't... 14:14

5 MR. GONZALEZ: Let me show you a document 14:14

6 that we've marked as Exhibit 1092. 14:14

7 (Document marked Exhibit 1092 14:14

8 for identification.) 14:15

9 MR. GONZALEZ: Sorry. Before I get to 1092, 14:15

10 I forgot to ask one question about what you just said 14:15

11 about Travis. 14:15

12 Q You didn't recall when you had the 14:15

13 conversation. 14:15

14 Do you recall where you were? 14:15

15 Were you having lunch somewhere? 14:15

16 A No, I don't really recall. We had various 14:15

17 contact at conferences and things. So, I don't 14:15

18 think -- we generally didn't have scheduled meetings, 14:15

19 but we'd kind of bump into each other. 14:15

20 Q All right. Fair enough. 14:15

21 Exhibit 1092 is an e-mail chain involving 14:15

22 Mr. Page. It's a one-page document, WAYMO '26141. 14:15

23 Mr. Page, do you recall receiving the bottom 14:15

24 e-mail from Mr. Levandowski on May 16, 2011? 14:15

25 A I'm sure I received it. Let me just take a 14:15

1 look at it. 14:15

2 Q Sure. 14:15

3 A (Witness reading document.) 14:15

4 Okay. 14:16

5 Q When Mr. Levandowski refers to 14:16

6 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

7 [REDACTED] ? 14:16

8 A Yeah, I think that's correct. 14:16

9 Q And why is it that you forwarded this to 14:16

10 Sebastian? 14:16

11 A I mean, this is a long time ago, in 2011. 14:16

12 But, I mean, it looks to me like, you know, I told 14:16

13 him, "Can you handle this?" So, I'm just saying, 14:16

14 like, I don't want to deal with this. 14:16

15 And then Sebastian confirms that it's an 14:16

16 issue; like, there's some sort of management issue. 14:16

17 Q "Anthony threatens to leave the team if he 14:17

18 isn't the single leader." 14:17

19 Do you see that? 14:17

20 A Yeah. 14:17

21 Q Is that kind of what you were thinking at the 14:17

22 time, that Anthony himself wants to be the leader of 14:17

23 this team? 14:17

24 A Well, I told you I think he was, like, a 14:17

25 significant leader or the main leader of the team 14:17

1 early on, and at some point that kind of transitioned. 14:17

2 And that's probably what this is about. 14:17

3 Q If you can recall, when is it that it 14:17

4 transitioned, in your mind? 14:17

5 Is it when you hired John as the CEO or the 14:17

6 leader of that group? 14:17

7 A No. I mean, that was much, much later. That 14:17

8 was recently. 14:17

9 Q Right. 14:17

10 So what -- what was the trigger, if you can 14:17

11 recall, that led to the transition? 14:17

12 A I don't know. I'm not that expert on that 14:17

13 question. I mean, I assume it has something to do 14:17

14 with Chris, who was in the -- running it. 14:17

15 Q Sebastian says: 14:17

16 "If he is the single leader, a good number of 14:17

17 team members will leave." 14:17

18 Do you see that? 14:17

19 A Yeah. 14:18

20 Q Did you ever talk to Sebastian about that? 14:18

21 A I mean, I don't recall. 14:18

22 Q The conversation that you had with TK, where 14:18

23 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

24 [REDACTED], was that before this lawsuit was 14:18

25 filed? 14:18

Page 113

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

1 A Yeah. I mean, that's sort of self-serving, 14:20

2 [REDACTED] . 14:20

3 Q Did you agree with his statement? 14:20

4 A No, I don't think so. 14:20

5 Q Why not? 14:20

6 A I mean, for the reason I just said. I think, 14:20

7 like -- I mean, for what I just -- the reasons I just 14:20

8 said. He's -- he's focused on what he's doing, which 14:20

9 he's arguing is going fine. 14:20

10 But I think that's -- even his own statement 14:20

11 is, like -- then he says: 14:20

12 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

13 [REDACTED] 14:20

14 So, I mean, it's, like, even 14:20

15 self-contradictory, I think. 14:20

16 Q So, other than it being self-serving and 14:20

17 possibly self-contradicting, as you just noted, was 14:20

18 there anything at the time that led you to believe 14:20

19 that [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] 14:21

1 [REDACTED] 14:21

2 Q All right. 14:21

3 And then, if you'd go to the top of the 14:21

4 second page. 14:21

5 A (Witness complies.) 14:21

6 Q It says on the second line: 14:21

7 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

8 [REDACTED] 14:21

9 Do you see that at the end of the second 14:21

10 line? 14:21

11 A Yeah. 14:21

12 Q Do you agree with that? 14:21

13 A I mean, in general, I would agree with the 14:21

14 sentiment of that. [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

15 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

16 [REDACTED] 14:21

17 Q Then he says in the next paragraph: 14:22

18 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

19 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

20 [REDACTED] 14:22

21 Do you see that? 14:22

22 A Yeah. 14:22

23 Q Would you agree with that? 14:22

24 A Let me read through this. 14:22

25 MR. VAN NEST: You should read the paragraph. 14:22

1 THE WITNESS: (Reading document.) 14:22

2 Sorry. Can you state the question again? 14:22

3 MR. GONZALEZ: Yes. 14:22

4 Q Did you agree with this statement that he's 14:22

5 making here about [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

6 [REDACTED]? 14:22

7 A I don't think that's the greatest plan at 14:23

8 this time. 14:23

9 Q Why not? 14:23

10 A I [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

11 [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

12 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

13 [REDACTED] 14:23

14 Q Then he says in the next line: 14:23

15 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

16 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

17 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

18 [REDACTED]? 14:23

19 A Yeah, I would think so. 14:23

20 Q Do you recall that [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

21 [REDACTED]? 14:23

22 A I don't recall it, but, I mean, it seems 14:23

23 pretty clear from the e-mail. 14:23

24 Q Do you recall that that was part of the 14:23

25 tension between him and John? 14:23

11	MR. VAN NEST: Objection; form.	14:24
12	THE WITNESS: Yeah, I'm not aware of any.	14:24
13	MR. GONZALEZ: Q. You mentioned earlier that	14:25
14	Mr. Levandowski had a negative impact on the	14:25
15	autonomous driving?	14:25
16	A I said may have had a negative impact.	14:25
17	Q You said "may have"?	14:25
18	A (Witness nods head.)	14:25
19	Q All right. Well, then let me clarify.	14:25
20	Sitting here today, is it your view that	14:25
21	Mr. Levandowski had a negative impact on Project	14:25
22	Chauffeur, or are you not sure?	14:25
23	A I already testified I think it could be -- go	14:25
24	either way. Could be either way, and that we'll learn	14:25
25	more, I expect.	14:25

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

1 Q Before, you said "and I will learn more"? 14:25

2 A I said we will learn more. 14:25

3 Q Before this lawsuit was filed -- or actually, 14:25

4 back up even more. 14:25

5 Before Mr. Levandowski left Google, as of 14:26

6 that point, January 2016, did you think that he had 14:26

7 had a negative impact on the company? 14:26

8 A I mean, I think there's a variety of opinions 14:26

9 on that point, and I tried to listen to all of them. 14:26

10 Q What -- what was your opinion? 14:26

11 A Well, I usually try to average them. And so 14:26

12 they averaged to roughly 0, I think. 14:26

13 Q All right. 14:26

14 So, you didn't have an opinion one way or the 14:26

15 other? 14:26

16 A Well, I told you I already -- I testified 14:26

17 already that I was supportive of having him work on 14:26

18 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] 14:26

22 Q Do you recall that Mr. Levandowski -- in 14:27

23 addition to [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] ? 14:27

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

1 MR. VAN NEST: Objection to the form of the 14:27
2 question. 14:27
3 THE WITNESS: Yes. Sorry. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] 14:27
10 Your question included a lot of things. 14:27
11 Maybe you can just state it again. 14:27
12 Q Yes. 14:27
13 I'm wondering: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] 14:27
18 A I don't recall. 14:28
19 Q Do you recall Mr. Levandowski [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]? 14:28
21 MR. VAN NEST: Object to form as to who 14:28
22 you -- who is "you." Is it Google or -- 14:28
23 THE WITNESS: Yeah. 14:28
24 MR. GONZALEZ: Q. The "you" would be you. 14:28
25 MR. VAN NEST: I mean, it's still ambiguous, 14:28

1 Counsel. 14:28

2 MR. GONZALEZ: Mr. Page. 14:28

3 MR. VAN NEST: As opposed to Google? 14:28

4 MR. GONZALEZ: Correct. 14:28

5 THE WITNESS: Oh, I see. 14:28

6 MR. VAN NEST: That's what he's asking. 14:28

7 THE WITNESS: Yeah, I certainly don't recall 14:28

8 that. 14:28

9 MR. GONZALEZ: Q. [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

18 A For Google? 14:29

19 Q Yes, for you. 14:29

20 A That's not something -- 14:29

21 MR. VAN NEST: Well, again, Counsel -- 14:29

22 MR. GONZALEZ: Q. Well, for -- for Google -- 14:29

23 MR. VAN NEST: -- in fairness -- 14:29

24 MR. GONZALEZ: Q. -- for Google or for you 14:29

25 personally? 14:29

Page 121

Page 122

1 MR. VAN NEST: Thank you. 14:31

2 MR. GONZALEZ: For the record, it's a 14:31

3 two-page e-mail string, with Bates stamp '11779 and 14:31

4 '80. 14:31

5 Q Sir, is this an e-mail communication between 14:31

6 you and Mr. Levandowski, dated January 25, 2016? 14:31

7 A Yes, from Anthony to me. 14:31

8 Q And then you write back to him: 14:31

9 "Thanks. Looks like a very good start. I'm 14:31

10 seeing him at 3:30. Will try to call you before 14:31

11 that." 14:31

12 A Yeah. 14:31

13 Q Then he says: 14:32

14 "Sweet. I'll be nearby. Thanks." 14:32

15 Right? 14:32

16 A Yeah. 14:32

17 Q When Mr. Levandowski, at the bottom of the 14:32

18 first page, has a number of different steps -- do you 14:32

19 see that? 14:32

20 A Yeah, I see the long list of numbered steps. 14:32

21 Q What is your recollection as to what these 14:32

22 steps were for? 14:32

23 A I mean, I don't recall this very well, but I 14:32

24 can read the document, if you'd like. 14:32

25 Q Well, when you write and say "looks like a 14:32

1 very good start," what were you referring to there? 14:32
2 Start to what? 14:32
3 A Well, I think this is what I've already 14:32
4 testified about, that [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] 14:32
7 Q So that, at least as of January 25, 2016, you 14:33
8 had a positive view of Mr. Levandowski's contribution 14:33
9 to Project Chauffeur; is that fair? 14:33
10 MR. VAN NEST: Object to the form of the 14:33
11 question. 14:33
12 THE WITNESS: Yeah, I was going to say, 14:33
13 object to logic, too. I think I was trying to -- 14:33
14 MR. GONZALEZ: That part is not allowed. 14:33
15 Q Go ahead. 14:33
16 A I -- I was trying hard to get him to 14:33
17 contribute positively to the team. 14:33
18 Q Okay. And you said -- let me just read to 14:33
19 you what you said. 14:33
20 A Okay. 14:33
21 Q Then I'm going to follow up. I'll use your 14:33
22 words -- 14:33
23 A Okay. 14:33
24 Q -- so that I don't use poor logic. 14:33
25 You say, [REDACTED] 14:33

1 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
2 [REDACTED] 14:33
3 If you thought he was bad for the company, 14:33
4 you would not have been doing that; isn't that fair? 14:33
5 A Well, I mean, you don't know the -- whether 14:34
6 something is going to work or not. You just know you 14:34
7 have an expectation. And I think this was a case 14:34
8 where I thought it could work pretty well, and I 14:34
9 thought it could not work well at all. I think it's 14:34
10 pretty clear it didn't work well at all, so -- 14:34
11 Q You say, It didn't work well at all. 14:34
12 What makes you say that? 14:34
13 Because he left shortly after this e-mail? 14:34
14 A Yeah, so -- and now I'm being deposed about 14:34
15 it, so that's probably enough outcomes. 14:34
16 Q All right. I get that. 14:34
17 On January 25, 2016, it was your state of 14:34
18 mind that Anthony Levandowski would be a good 14:34
19 candidate to [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
20 [REDACTED]; is that right? 14:34
21 MR. VAN NEST: Object to the form. 14:34
22 THE WITNESS: Sorry. I guess, can you -- can 14:34
23 you just -- can we state the question again? 14:35
24 MR. GONZALEZ: Yes. 14:35
25 Q Just going back to your earlier testimony, as 14:35

1 of January 25, 2016, it was your state of mind that 14:35
2 Anthony Levandowski [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
3 [REDACTED]; true? 14:35
4 A I mean, I've already testified [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
5 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
6 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
7 [REDACTED] 14:35
8 But I think the risk in this was him getting 14:35
9 along with the rest of the team -- 14:35
10 Q But you were -- 14:35
11 A -- as I've already stated. 14:35
12 Q I'm sorry. Were you finished? 14:35
13 A Yeah. I mean, the risk of it was him getting 14:35
14 along with the other -- rest of the team and being 14:35
15 able to work productively with other people, which he 14:36
16 had a mixed reputation about. 14:36
17 Q And, you were willing to assume that risk 14:36
18 because of his particular skill set; true? 14:36
19 A I mean, a combination, I guess, of a lot of 14:36
20 factors. I mean, I was advising the team on this. 14:36
21 Like, if, you know, John Krafcik came to me 14:36
22 and said, like, "There is no way this is going to 14:36
23 work," I probably would have said, "Okay." 14:36
24 Like, I mean, I was trying to help and not 14:36
25 making decisions necessarily. 14:36

1 Q But John never came to you and said that; did 14:36
2 he? 14:36

3 A I don't know that he particularly got a 14:36
4 chance, because I think this was somewhat underway, 14:36
5 and then Anthony kind of went out the door. But, I 14:36
6 don't remember the exact timing. 14:36

7 (Document marked Exhibit 1095 14:36
8 for identification.) 14:36

9 MR. GONZALEZ: I'm handing you a document 14:36
10 marked as Exhibit 1095. It's a one-page e-mail, dated 14:37
11 March 8, 2016, WAYMO '22505. 14:37

12 Q Is this an e-mail that you received from 14:37
13 Mr. Teller? 14:37

14 A I mean, undoubtedly, yeah. 14:37

15 Q Is this when you first found out that 14:37
16 Mr. Levandowski was working on self-driving trucks, or 14:37
17 did you already know? 14:37

18 A I don't recall. 14:37

19 Q As of March 8, 2016, when you received this 14:37
20 e-mail that Anthony is working on self-driving trucks, 14:37
21 did you take any steps to protect the rights of 14:37
22 Alphabet, Google, or Waymo at that time? 14:37

23 A I don't recall. 14:37

24 Q Were you concerned, when you learned that 14:37
25 Anthony was working on self-driving trucks? 14:38

1 A I don't recall. I mean, you know, there's -- 14:38
2 he's probably -- you know, probably first we learned 14:38
3 he was making a company, I don't know. Like, I mean, 14:38
4 there's probably a lot of different information you 14:38
5 get. So, I have limited recollection of it. 14:38

6 Q You don't recall directing anybody to take 14:38
7 any action; do you? 14:38

8 A I don't recall, and I don't know why I would. 14:38
9 I mean, that in itself might not be an issue; right? 14:38
10 It may or may not be. 14:38

11 Q You didn't think it was? 14:38

12 A I don't know what my state of mind was. I 14:38
13 don't recall. 14:38

14 Q Well, if you thought it was an issue, you 14:38
15 would have done something about it; right? 14:38

16 MR. VAN NEST: Object to form. 14:38

17 THE WITNESS: I've already said I didn't 14:38
18 recall what I did or didn't do, based on this e-mail. 14:38

19 MR. GONZALEZ: Q. Sitting here today, you 14:38
20 don't recall taking any steps after learning that 14:38
21 Anthony was working on self-driving trucks; is that 14:38
22 right? 14:38

23 A Based on this e-mail? 14:38

24 Q Yes. 14:39

25 I mean, the e-mail clearly reflects that, as 14:39

1 of March 8th, 2016, if you didn't know before, you 14:39
2 certainly know then that Anthony is working on 14:39
3 self-driving trucks; right? 14:39
4 A Yeah. 14:39
5 Q And, sitting here today, you don't recall 14:39
6 taking any steps to protect the rights of Alphabet in 14:39
7 connection with learning that fact? 14:39
8 A But I don't know -- I guess I'm objecting to 14:39
9 the implication that I should take action based on 14:39
10 that. 14:39
11 Q I want to be real clear. I'm not implying 14:39
12 that at all. 14:39
13 A All right. 14:39
14 Q I'm just trying to find out what you did and 14:39
15 didn't do. 14:39
16 A I don't -- I mean, I don't remember what I 14:39
17 didn't do -- did or did not do, based on that. 14:39
18 MR. GONZALEZ: Let's go off record. 14:39
19 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are off the record at 14:39
20 2:40 p.m. 14:39
21 (Recess taken.) 14:39
22 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the record 14:42
23 at 2:56 p.m. 14:55
24 MR. GONZALEZ: Q. Sir, do you recall having 14:55
25 conversations with Sebastian Thrun about the 14:56

1 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
2 [REDACTED] ? 14:56
3 A I mean, I don't remember having a 14:56
4 conversation, but I've seen an e-mail. 14:56
5 Q All right. 14:56
6 When did you last see that e-mail? 14:56
7 A Very recently. 14:56
8 Q Okay. And, did you remember it? 14:56
9 A No, I did not remember until I saw it. 14:56
10 Q All right. 14:56
11 Let me show you the e-mail that you're 14:56
12 referring to. 14:56
13 (Document marked Exhibit 1096 14:56
14 for identification.) 14:56
15 MR. GONZALEZ: Q. 1096, is that the e-mail 14:56
16 that you're referencing? 14:56
17 A Yes, I think so. 14:56
18 Q Do you remember responding? 14:56
19 A I mean, I don't know that I responded. I 14:56
20 mean, this is clearly not a good idea, so -- 14:56
21 Q Did you write back to him, telling him that? 14:56
22 A I don't remember. But, it obviously did not 14:57
23 happen, so -- 14:57
24 Q Is there any reason why you didn't respond, 14:57
25 telling him it's clearly not a good idea? 14:57

25

///

14:58

1	(Document marked Exhibit 1097)	14:58
2	for identification.)	14:58
3	MR. GONZALEZ: This is a one-page e-mail,	14:58
4	with Bates stamp WAYMO '26168.	14:58
5	Q Sir, is this an e-mail chain, dated	14:58
6	December 6, 2013?	14:59
7	A Yeah.	14:59
8	Q And you'll see here that there is a	14:59
9	discussion about [REDACTED]?	14:59
10	A Yeah.	14:59
11	Q Do you recall [REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	I [REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	I [REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	I [REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	I [REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	I [REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED] [REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	14:59
23	Q Well, let me be -- let me ask you to be more	15:00
24	specific.	15:00
25	[REDACTED]	15:00

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

1 A [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] 15:00
3 Q All right. 15:00
4 When you say [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] ? 15:00
6 MR. VAN NEST: Objection to the form. 15:00
7 MR. GONZALEZ: Q. [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] 15:00
12 Q Do you recall any? 15:00
13 A Sure. 15:00
14 Q [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] 15:01

Page 133

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

- [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

- [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

- [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

- [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

- [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

- [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

15:02



15:03

Page 136

1 to happen. I'm reading your words. 15:04

2 Let me rephrase it using your words. I'm not 15:04

3 trying to -- 15:04

4 A I'm not -- 15:04

5 Q -- trick you. 15:04

6 On what do you base your statement that 15:04

7 Mr. Levandowski participated in getting it to happen? 15:04

8 A Just my general recollection. I don't, like, 15:04

9 have a citation for that. 15:05

10 Q [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] 15:05

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

1

■

■

■

■

■

■

■

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

■

■

■

■

■

■

■

[REDACTED]

■

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

MR. GONZALEZ: Let me -- let me ask you then

a more general question.

Q When you say Mr. Levandowski was involved,

what was his involvement?

MR. VAN NEST: Asked and answered.

MR. GONZALEZ: And --

MR. VAN NEST: Oh.

MR. GONZALEZ: -- let me be more clear.

Q What was Mr. Levandowski's involvement in

[REDACTED]

■

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

■

[REDACTED]

■

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

15:06

15:06

15:06

15:06

15:06

15:06

15:06

15:06

15:06

15:06

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

15:06

Page 138

1 [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] 15:06
3 Q When is the last time that you spoke to 15:06
4 Travis Kalanick? 15:07
5 A When was the last time? I'd have to think 15:07
6 about that. 15:07
7 I'm not exactly sure. I think it may have 15:07
8 been a conversation we had that was ostensibly about 15:07
9 [REDACTED] but I don't remember for sure. 15:07
10 Q Have you spoken to him since the lawsuit was 15:07
11 filed? 15:07
12 A I don't think so, no. 15:07
13 Q So how many -- well, you said you had a 15:07
14 conversation ostensibly about [REDACTED] 15:07
15 Can you tell me what you meant by that 15:07
16 phrase? What is it that -- 15:07
17 A He -- he -- he kind of put in a request 15:07
18 saying, [REDACTED] But I 15:07
19 don't think that was his actual purpose, but -- 15:07
20 Q All right. 15:07
21 He put in a request to who? 15:07
22 A To me. 15:07
23 Q All right. 15:07
24 He sent you a text or something or -- 15:07
25 A I don't know. My assistant just said, Travis 15:07

1 wants to call you, or something like that, and talk to 15:08
2 you about [REDACTED]. 15:08
3 I'm, like, Oh, okay, or whatever. 15:08
4 So, I had to take the call. 15:08
5 Q So, you agreed to take a call from 15:08
6 Mr. Kalanick to talk about [REDACTED] 15:08
7 A Yes. 15:08
8 Q And when was it? 15:08
9 A I don't remember the day, but it was fairly 15:08
10 recently. I mean, before all this stuff blew up. 15:08
11 Q Right. That's my understanding, too. 15:08
12 But what's your recollection of -- of a date? 15:08
13 For example, was it this year, or was it last 15:08
14 year? 15:08
15 A I don't remember the date. I'm sorry. 15:08
16 Q Okay. Was it a phone call with just the two 15:08
17 of you? 15:08
18 A Yes. 15:08
19 Q How long did the phone call last? 15:08
20 A I don't know. Maybe, like, 30 minutes or 15:08
21 something like that. 15:08
22 Q And, just generally, what did you talk about 15:08
23 in approximately 30 minutes? 15:08
24 A Well, the first part of the call, you know, 15:08
25 was about basically, [REDACTED] 15:08

--	--	--	--

15:10

15:10

Page 142

[illegible]

15:13

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

1

Q

█

█

█

█

█

█

█

█

█

█

█

█

█

█

█

█

█

█

█

█

█

█

24

Q I get it. I don't want to cut you off.

15:14

25

A No, it's fine.

15:14

Page 144

1 Q Having now discussed this conversation a 15:14
2 couple of times today, do you believe that you've now 15:14
3 told me everything you can remember that either one of 15:14
4 you said? 15:14

5 A I mean, for the moment, yeah. 15:14

6 Q Is there anything in writing that reflects 15:14
7 any of the conversation? 15:14

8 A I can't think of anything offhand. 15:14

9 Q Did you talk to anybody about the 15:14
10 conversation after you got off the phone? 15:14

11 A I don't remember. I think probably would 15:14
12 have updated people, you know, on my team, but I don't 15:14
13 remember. 15:15

14 Q Do you still have -- does your company still 15:15
15 have the investment in Uber? 15:15

16 A Yes. 15:15

17 Q Having thought about it maybe a little bit, 15:15
18 any idea what the amount of the investment is today? 15:15

19 A It's a big number. [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] 15:15

21 Q Why was Waymo spun out as a separate company? 15:15

22 A I mean, I'm not sure I'd say it's a spinout. 15:15
23 But I think it was kind of birthed as a separate 15:15
24 company within Alphabet. But, it's not been spun out 15:16
25 of Alphabet or anything. 15:16

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

1 Q All right. 15:16

2 Why was it created as a separate company 15:16

3 under the umbrella of Alphabet? 15:16

4 A [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED] 15:16

9 Q At the time that it was spun out as a 15:16

10 separate company, was there a valuation done of Waymo? 15:16

11 A Sorry. Again, the spinout I wouldn't say. 15:16

12 Q Well, I don't mean to suggest or imply 15:16

13 anything by it. 15:16

14 At the time that Waymo was set up as a 15:16

15 separate company under the umbrella of Alphabet, was 15:16

16 there a valuation done of the company at that time? 15:16

17 A [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED] 15:17

25 A I mean, I don't recall. 15:17

Page 146

1 Q [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
10 Q What is Waymo worth today? 15:18
11 MR. VAN NEST: Object to the form. 15:18
12 THE WITNESS: Yeah, I don't know the answer 15:18
13 to that. 15:18
14 MR. GONZALEZ: Q. Who would you ask? 15:18
15 A [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] 15:18
17 Q Well, isn't one of the things that you expect 15:18
18 your team to do within Alphabet, is to know the value 15:18
19 of each of your subsidiaries? 15:18
20 A Yeah, I guess in that sense, I guess 15:18
21 somewhat. 15:18
22 Q So, who is the person who is responsible for 15:18
23 setting up the value of what is now Waymo? 15:18
24 A I mean, a little bit depends on the process. 15:18
25 And, I'm not sure of the exact process we use for that 15:18

Page 148

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

1 Mr. Kalanick, after you received this e-mail, to talk 15:20

2 about Uber, your investment in the company? 15:20

3 A Yeah, I guess my recollection around -- in 15:20

4 the early days of our relationship, the main issue we 15:20

5 had was, [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

6 [REDACTED] So, I'm not really remembering this 15:20

7 e-mail. Like, I sort of assume it's actually about 15:20

8 that. 15:20

9 Q Other -- 15:20

10 A My involvement with him was around that. 15:20

11 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

12 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

13 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

14 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

15 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

16 [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

17 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

18 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

19 [REDACTED] [REDACTED] 15:21

20 Q Is there anything else you've discussed with 15:21

21 Mr. Kalanick, with respect to [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

22 [REDACTED]? 15:21

23 A I mean, I don't -- I don't recall any other 15:21

24 major kind of conversations we had. 15:21

25 Q Do you recall a meeting that you had with 15:21

Page 149

1 Mr. Kalanick and Mr. Drummond? 15:21

2 A I mean, maybe. Do you have more context? 15:21

3 Q A lunch meeting to discuss the [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] . 15:21

5 A Oh, I don't recall that offhand, no. 15:21

6 Q To your knowledge, has there ever been any 15:22
7 change in projections, for what is now Waymo, as a 15:22
8 result of different people leaving the company? 15:22

9 A Sorry. Projections of what? 15:22

10 Q Projections or benchmarks of how the company 15:22
11 might do in the future. 15:22

12 MR. VAN NEST: I'll object to the form. 15:22

13 THE WITNESS: Yeah, I'm not aware of such 15:22
14 things. I mean, it's... 15:22

15 MR. GONZALEZ: Q. Other than whatever may 15:22
16 have been said in the phone call that you've testified 15:22
17 about with Mr. Kalanick, did you ever express concern 15:22
18 to anyone at Uber about possible misconduct that was 15:22
19 somehow related to Anthony Levandowski? 15:22

20 A Well, I'm not sure I stated that to Travis, 15:22
21 first of all. 15:23

22 Q I'm not saying you did, either. 15:23

23 A Okay. 15:23

24 Q That's why I'm just trying to set aside that 15:23
25 conversation. 15:23

Page 151

1 recalled anything specific earlier. 15:24

2 Q Is there something that you're recalling now 15:24

3 that's specific about having delegated a task to 15:24

4 someone specific? 15:24

5 A If you'll look in my testimony, I believe 15:24

6 I -- I stated that it's likely I delegated to someone, 15:24

7 probably David. 15:24

8 Q But, you don't have any specific recollection 15:24

9 of having done so, and you don't recall them coming 15:24

10 back and reporting on anything; is that right? 15:24

11 MR. VAN NEST: Objection. That's compound. 15:24

12 He has testified about this earlier, Counsel. 15:24

13 MR. GONZALEZ: Yeah, but I want to make sure 15:24

14 that we're not miscommunicating here. 15:24

15 Q You -- 15:24

16 A I have none -- no reason to believe that we 15:24

17 did anything unreasonable with respect to our legal 15:24

18 proceedings against -- 15:24

19 MR. VAN NEST: That's not what he asked. 15:25

20 He did testify previously that he thought 15:25

21 [REDACTED] -- 15:25

22 THE WITNESS: I think -- 15:25

23 MR. VAN NEST: -- [REDACTED]. 15:25

24 THE WITNESS: -- I think we went above and 15:25

25 beyond during normal course of business to be friendly 15:25

Page 153

1 Q And, as of this point, he's reporting to you 15:27
2 on a variety of issues involving [REDACTED]; is that 15:27
3 right? 15:27

4 MR. VAN NEST: Take your time and review the 15:27
5 memo. 15:27

6 THE WITNESS: Looks like a number of things. 15:27

7 MR. GONZALEZ: Q. If you look in the middle, 15:27
8 there's a reference to [REDACTED] 15:27

9 Do you see that? 15:27

10 A Yes, I see that. 15:27

11 Q What is that? 15:27

12 A That's just [REDACTED]. 15:27

13 Q And, [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] 15:27

[illegible]

15:29

Q

Page 156

Page 157

Page 158

1 A [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] 15:33
10 Q Exhibit 1100? 15:33
11 A Yeah, I think -- yes, 1100. 15:33
12 MR. GONZALEZ: Okay. Counsel, Mr. Chatterjee 15:34
13 wants to ask some questions. I obviously have a lot 15:34
14 more questions for this witness. And I realize the 15:34
15 Court has limited us to four hours. So, I'm going to, 15:34
16 as a courtesy, pass the baton over to Mr. Chatterjee. 15:34
17 We reserve our rights. I'll look at my notes and may 15:34
18 have a few more questions when he's done. 15:34
19 But for now, I want to go off the record so I 15:34
20 don't use up time while we're switching. 15:34
21 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are off the record at 15:34
22 3:34 p.m. 15:34
23 (Recess taken.) 15:34
24 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the record 15:35
25 at 3:36 p.m. 15:35

1		15:35
2	EXAMINATION	15:35
3	BY MR. CHATTERJEE:	15:35
4	Q Hi, Mr. Brin. We haven't met before. My	15:36
5	name is Neel Chatterjee. I represent an entity called	15:36
6	Otto Trucking.	15:36
7	MR. VAN NEST: Mr. Page.	15:36
8	MR. CHATTERJEE: Mr. Page. It's -- the names	15:36
9	are used so interchangeably in the market. Mr. Page.	15:36
10	Q Have you ever heard of Otto Trucking?	15:36
11	A I mean, I've heard of Otto.	15:36
12	Q Have you ever heard of Otto Trucking, that	15:36
13	company specifically?	15:36
14	A I'm not sure. Is there a difference between	15:36
15	Otto and Otto Trucking?	15:36
16	Q Well, what do you understand Otto to be?	15:36
17	A Sorry. Today I see it as part of Uber, I	15:36
18	suppose.	15:36
19	Q Okay. Would it surprise you to learn that	15:36
20	Otto Trucking today is not part of Uber?	15:36
21	A I don't know.	15:36
22	Q Would it surprise you?	15:36
23	A Depends what Otto Trucking is, I suppose.	15:36
24	Q Do you know what Otto Trucking is?	15:36
25	A Apparently not, I guess.	15:36

1 Q Are you aware of any wrongful acts that Otto 15:36
2 Trucking has engaged in? 15:37

3 MR. VAN NEST: Objection. 15:37

4 And I'll instruct you, Mr. Page, to the 15:37
5 extent you have information provided by one of the 15:37
6 lawyers for Waymo or Alphabet, do not answer. 15:37

7 If you have any independent information, you 15:37
8 may answer. 15:37

9 THE WITNESS: I mean, I'm not sure. 15:37

10 MR. CHATTERJEE: Q. So is that a "no"? 15:37

11 A State the question again, please. 15:37

12 Q Other than any conversations you've had with 15:37
13 your lawyers, are you aware of any wrongful acts that 15:37
14 Otto Trucking has engaged in associated with this 15:37
15 lawsuit? 15:37

16 A Seems like a very strange line of 15:37
17 questioning, because I'm not sure about the entity 15:37
18 with which I'm replying. 15:37

19 Q So, you don't know what it is; right? 15:37

20 A I mean, I'm not sure whether I know what it 15:37
21 is or not, since I don't -- 15:37

22 Q Well, you either know what it is or it isn't. 15:38
23 Do you know what Otto Trucking is? 15:38

24 A I suppose I do not. 15:38

25 Q Do you know what the business of Otto 15:38

1 Trucking is? 15:38

2 A I suppose I do not. 15:38

3 Q Okay. Do you -- did you know that Otto 15:38

4 Trucking is an entity that is completely separate from 15:38

5 Uber? 15:38

6 A I did not know that until you stated that. 15:38

7 Q Did you know that Uber has no ownership 15:38

8 interests in Otto Trucking? 15:38

9 MR. VAN NEST: I'll object to the form. Did 15:38

10 you say "an" or "no"? 15:38

11 MR. CHATTERJEE: Q. Did you know that Uber 15:38

12 has no ownership interest in Otto Trucking? 15:38

13 MR. VAN NEST: Object to form. 15:38

14 THE WITNESS: All right. This seems like 15:38

15 something complicated that I don't know anything 15:38

16 about. 15:38

17 MR. CHATTERJEE: Okay. 15:38

18 Q Do you know why Otto Trucking is named as a 15:38

19 defendant in this case? 15:38

20 MR. VAN NEST: Again, anything you learned 15:38

21 from lawyers is off limits. Don't answer. 15:38

22 If you have some independent knowledge, 15:38

23 Mr. Page, go ahead and provide it. 15:38

24 THE WITNESS: All right. I don't know. 15:38

25 MR. CHATTERJEE: Q. Did Anthony Levandowski 15:39

1 ever express concerns to you about the valuation of 15:39
2 Project Chauffeur? 15:39
3 A I don't recall. 15:39
4 Q You were aware that [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]; correct? 15:39
6 A I mean, [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] 15:39
9 MR. CHATTERJEE: Let's mark this as 15:39
10 Exhibit 1102. 15:39
11 (Document marked Exhibit 1102 15:39
12 for identification.) 15:39
13 MR. CHATTERJEE: Can you pass these down? 15:39
14 Q Mr. Page, what I've handed you, that's been 15:40
15 marked as Exhibit 1102, is a document dated 15:40
16 September 23rd, 2015. 15:40
17 Have you ever seen this document before? 15:40
18 A I mean, I don't -- I don't think so. 15:40
19 Q Okay. All right. 15:40
20 Who is Don Harrison? 15:40
21 A I mean, it says right here he's vice 15:40
22 president of corporate development. 15:40
23 Q Do you know who he is? 15:40
24 A He is -- yeah, he's an executive for the 15:40
25 company. 15:40

1 Q Okay. Well, previously, I -- if I remember 15:40
2 correctly, you couldn't recall who was involved in [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
3 [REDACTED]. 15:40
4 Does this refresh your recollection at all as 15:40
5 to whether Mr. Harrison was involved? 15:40
6 A I mean, I don't recall. 15:40
7 Q Do you remember if [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
8 [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
9 [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
10 [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
11 [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
12 [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
13 [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
14 [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
15 [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] 15:41
16 MR. VAN NEST: He's asking for your 15:41
17 recollection -- 15:41
18 THE WITNESS: No, I don't -- 15:41
19 MR. VAN NEST: -- not what the document says. 15:41
20 THE WITNESS: Yeah, I don't -- I don't 15:41
21 recall. 15:41
22 MR. CHATTERJEE: Okay. 15:41
23 Q Do you remember anyone expressing concern 15:41
24 that [REDACTED]? 15:41
25

Page 165

Q

Page 166

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

1 A Don't recall. 15:43

2 Q Do you know if anyone took over for 15:43

3 Mr. Harrison on [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

4 [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

5 [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

6 [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

7 [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

8 [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

9 A I don't recall. 15:44

10 Q So, is that a "no," or you just don't know? 15:44

11 A I don't recall. 15:44

12 MR. VAN NEST: He said he didn't recall. 15:44

13 That was his answer. 15:44

14 MR. CHATTERJEE: Q. Are you aware that 15:44

15 Google asked Anthony Levandowski to sign a noncompete 15:44

16 agreement in 2014? 15:44

17 A No, I'm not aware of that or I don't recall 15:44

18 it. 15:45

19 Q Who is Astro Teller? 15:45

20 A Astro is in charge of X. 15:45

21 Q And what does that mean, to be in charge of 15:45

22 X? 15:45

23 A Well, X is our -- kind of our division that 15:45

24 does various kinds of moonshot projects. That's 15:45

25 widely known. 15:45

1 Q And one other question: Did you ever talk to 15:45
2 Sergey Brin about Anthony Levandowski? Do you know if 15:45
3 you ever did that? 15:45
4 A I mean, I imagine we discussed it at some 15:45
5 point. 15:45
6 Q Would you have exchanged e-mails or text 15:45
7 messages or instant messages? 15:45
8 A Unlikely. We generally just discuss. 15:45
9 Q Let's mark -- 15:45
10 A I guess we might e-mail also. 15:45
11 Q Did you search for those e-mails? 15:45
12 A I mean -- 15:45
13 MR. VAN NEST: Objection to form. 15:45
14 THE WITNESS: -- I mean, I have -- I assume 15:45
15 that there was a lot of discovery done. 15:45
16 MR. CHATTERJEE: Let's -- 15:46
17 THE WITNESS: I think that's the job. 15:46
18 MR. CHATTERJEE: Okay. I didn't mean to 15:46
19 interrupt. 15:46
20 Let's mark this as 1103. 15:46
21 (Document marked Exhibit 1103 15:46
22 for identification.) 15:46
23 MR. CHATTERJEE: Can you pass this around? 15:46
24 MR. VAN NEST: Counsel, can I get a -- 15:46
25 MR. CHATTERJEE: Oh, I'm sorry. 15:46

Page 168

1 MR. VAN NEST: Yeah. Thank you. 15:46

2 MR. CHATTERJEE: I thought I had an extra 15:46

3 copy. 15:46

4 Q The document I've handed you, marked as 15:46

5 Exhibit 1103, is an e-mail from Chris Urmson to Sergey 15:46

6 Brin and Astro Teller, dated October 24th, 2014. 15:46

7 Do you see that? 15:46

8 A Yep. 15:46

9 Q I asked you before if you were aware of any 15:46

10 discussions in October of 2014, with Mr. Levandowski, 15:46

11 about [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] 15:46

16 Do you see that? 15:46

17 A Yep. 15:46

18 Q Were you involved in any discussions in 15:46

19 October of 2014 about having Anthony leave the company 15:47

20 with [REDACTED]? 15:47

21 A I mean, I don't recall. And I'm not -- you 15:47

22 know, I'm not on this e-mail. It doesn't really 15:47

23 trigger any additional recollection there. 15:47

24 Q So, to the best of your recollection, you 15:47

25 weren't involved in that at all? 15:47

Page 170

1 Q Did anyone else at Waymo or Google express 15:48
2 concerns to you that they could not trust Anthony 15:48
3 Levandowski? 15:48

4 A Yeah, sorry. Let me -- let me go back to the 15:48
5 previous one. 15:48

6 I mean, I think there were generally a lot of 15:48
7 concerns about Anthony, and people's -- people were 15:48
8 definitely concerned about trusting him. I don't 15:48
9 think Chris expressed that to me directly, but I think 15:48
10 I was aware of that generally. 15:48

11 Q Who were the people that did? 15:48

12 A I can't recall. 15:48

13 Q Was Mr. Thrun one of them? 15:48

14 A I can't recall. 15:48

15 Q Was Mr. Salesky one of them? 15:48

16 A You know, I -- I don't recall. I didn't have 15:49
17 that much contact with Mr. Salesky. 15:49

18 Q Do you remember referring to something as 15:49
19 [REDACTED]? 15:49

20 A I mean, I don't remember that in the context 15:49
21 of this particularly. [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

22 [REDACTED] 15:49

23 MR. CHATTERJEE: There is a -- a document. 15:49
24 I'm going to -- I'm going to mark it as a new 15:49
25 document, because I don't want to hunt through all the 15:49

1 old ones. In the interest of time, I'm going to mark 15:49
2 this as 1104. 15:49
3 (Document marked Exhibit 1104 15:49
4 for identification.) 15:49
5 MR. CHATTERJEE: This is a document that 15:49
6 Mr. Gonzalez gave you before. 15:49
7 THE WITNESS: This is one I saw already. 15:49
8 MR. CHATTERJEE: Q. And, in this document, 15:49
9 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
10 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
11 [REDACTED]. 15:50
12 Do you see that? 15:50
13 A Yeah. 15:50
14 Q Do you see how it says at the end [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
15 [REDACTED]? 15:50
16 Any idea what he's referring to there? 15:50
17 A I mean, I think that's just generally the 15:50
18 [REDACTED], in Valley terminology. 15:50
19 Q So, it wasn't referring to any specific 15:50
20 nomenclature like that that was being used inside of 15:50
21 the Project Chauffeur team? 15:50
22 A I mean, I don't know. You're asking me to 15:50
23 interpret what I think. I don't really know. And I 15:50
24 was generally -- this e-mail is kind of crazy, I 15:50
25 think. 15:50

1 Q Were -- were you ever aware of people 15:50
2 referring to [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
3 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
4 [REDACTED]? 15:50
5 A Oh, I see. I mean, I don't recall, but that 15:50
6 seems plausible. 15:50
7 Q You don't recall anyone ever saying that? 15:50
8 A Yeah, I don't know. It's really hard to keep 15:50
9 thousands of code names straight also across lots of 15:51
10 companies. 15:51
11 Q Did you ever have a conversation with Astro 15:51
12 Teller expressing concerns about Anthony Levandowski 15:51
13 leaving and helping the competition? 15:51
14 A I mean, I remember, like, you know, thinking 15:51
15 Anthony is a significant person and, like, we should 15:51
16 try to -- try to retain him and make him productive, 15:51
17 if we can. 15:51
18 Q That was a different question than I asked. 15:51
19 Did you ever have a conversation with Astro 15:51
20 Teller expressing concern about Anthony Levandowski 15:51
21 leaving Google and helping the competition? 15:51
22 A I mean, I don't recall that. But I'm -- I 15:51
23 mean, that's consistent with what I said before, what 15:51
24 I just said. 15:51
25 Q Do you remember having that -- 15:51

Page 174

1 A That sounds very implausible. 15:52

2 Q Okay. Why is it implausible? 15:53

3 A Well, I just testified, I had very limited 15:53
4 contact with him, and I just don't remember anything 15:53
5 like that. 15:53

6 Q Do you remember Chris Urmson ever saying to 15:53
7 people at Google that Anthony Levandowski needed to be 15:53
8 fired because he was trying to sell a group en masse 15:53
9 to Uber? 15:53

10 A No, I do not remember that. 15:53

11 MR. CHATTERJEE: Okay. So, let's mark this 15:53
12 as 1105. 15:53

13 (Document marked Exhibit 1105 15:53
14 for identification.) 15:53

15 MR. CHATTERJEE: Mr. Page, the document I've 15:53
16 handed you is Document 1105. It's a string of 15:53
17 e-mails. 15:53

18 Q But, there's an e-mail from Chris Urmson in 15:53
19 the middle, dated August 4th, 2015. You see how it 15:54
20 starts: 15:54

21 [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] 15:54

1 Do you see that? 15:54

2 A Yeah. And I'm not on this e-mail. 15:54

3 Q Do you have any reason to dispute that? 15:54

4 MR. VAN NEST: Objection to the form of the 15:54

5 question. 15:54

6 To dispute what? 15:54

7 MR. CHATTERJEE: To dispute what Mr. Urmson 15:54

8 is saying in this e-mail. 15:54

9 MR. VAN NEST: Object to the form. 15:54

10 THE WITNESS: I mean, I believe this is an 15:54

11 e-mail that Chris wrote that I'm not copied on. 15:54

12 MR. CHATTERJEE: Right. 15:54

13 Q [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] 15:54

18 A I mean, I don't remember when this happened 15:54

19 as compared to when -- when did he actually leave? 15:54

20 Q This is August 4th, 2015, according to the 15:54

21 e-mail, if you look at it. 15:55

22 A Yeah. What date did he actually leave? 15:55

23 Q He left in January of 2016. 15:55

24 A This was a long time before then. 15:55

25 I remember there was -- you know, there was 15:55

1 some concern. I remember percolating up to me that 15:55
2 there was some concern about him doing some things, 15:55
3 and then I think it then wasn't substantiated. That's 15:55
4 what I remember. 15:55

5 Q And what was the concern expressed about him 15:55
6 doing some things? What were those things? 15:55

7 A I mean, something like this, but I don't 15:55
8 remember the detail of that as it percolated up to me. 15:55

9 Q Well, just to make sure, because you said you 15:55
10 hadn't seen this e-mail before, tell me what was told 15:55
11 to you as what the concern was. 15:55

12 A I mean, so this is not sort of something new. 15:55
13 There was always concern. You know, people would say, 15:55
14 Oh, Anthony is doing this. Anthony is doing that. 15:55

15 Q What is the "this" and "that"? 15:55

16 A Something they didn't like. 15:55

17 But remember, these people also didn't like 15:55
18 each other very well, and so they tended to say that a 15:56
19 lot. This had been going on for a while. So, that's 15:56
20 kind of my level of recollection about this. 15:56

21 That's -- that's kind of -- Hanke was there 15:56
22 and, you know, maybe it turned out to be more true, 15:56
23 but we didn't know that at the time. At least, I 15:56
24 didn't know that at the time. 15:56

25 Q I just want to get a little more granular. 15:56

1 When you used the word "this" and "that," I'm trying 15:56
2 to understand: What were the complaints that people 15:56
3 were raising specifically, as best you know? 15:56
4 A I can't recollect that. But, I mean... 15:56
5 Q But you were aware sometime in -- in 2015, 15:56
6 that people were complaining that Anthony might be 15:56
7 trying to take a group of people to Uber? 15:56
8 A No, no. 15:56
9 MR. VAN NEST: Object to the form of the 15:56
10 question. 15:56
11 THE WITNESS: Again, as I've already stated, 15:56
12 I wasn't aware of, like -- definitely was not aware 15:56
13 that that was a significantly likely thing in August 15:56
14 of 2015. 15:56
15 MR. CHATTERJEE: Q. Were you aware of people 15:56
16 making those kinds, of accusations? 15:56
17 A Not those kind of accusations, but general 15:57
18 accusations about his character and his general 15:57
19 ethics. 15:57
20 Q And what were the accusation about his 15:57
21 general ethics? 15:57
22 A I don't remember the details of it, but more 15:57
23 of those kind of flavor. 15:57
24 Q Did you trust him? 15:57
25 A Oh, I mean, obviously, too much, I guess. 15:57

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

1 Q Well, did you trust him? 15:57

2 A To an extent. I think, like, he was -- to 15:57

3 me, he seemed like he was likely to be somewhat 15:57

4 trustworthy as long as he felt he was getting what he 15:57

5 needed. But, I think in retrospect, that was not 15:57

6 correct. 15:57

7 Q But many people had told you that they didn't 15:57

8 think he was trustworthy; right? 15:57

9 A Yeah. I guess I should have listened to 15:57

10 those people. 15:57

11 Q And, was part of the reason that his role in 15:57

12 Project Chauffeur was reduced over time was because of 15:57

13 those issues? 15:57

14 A I don't know. That's hard to know, I guess. 15:57

15 I -- you know, I wasn't involved in that directly. 15:58

16 Q Who would know? 15:58

17 A I assume people who have had more contact 15:58

18 with him. 15:58

19 Q Can you give me some names? 15:58

20 A Chris is probably who had the most contact 15:58

21 with him. 15:58

22 Q What about Mr. Thrun or Mr. Salesky? 15:58

23 A Yeah, I mean, I'd probably say Chris had by 15:58

24 far the most contact with him during recent history. 15:58

25 MR. CHATTERJEE: I do need to take a break 15:58

1 after this because I'm out of little stickers. 15:58

2 Oh, good. 15:58

3 MR. VAN NEST: Problem solved. 15:58

4 MR. CHATTERJEE: Problem solved. They're 15:58

5 always a step ahead of me. 15:59

6 (Document marked Exhibit 1106 15:59

7 for identification.) 15:59

8 MR. CHATTERJEE: This is a document that's 15:59

9 been marked as 1106. 15:59

10 Q So, Mr. Page, what I've handed you as 15:59

11 document number -- Exhibit 1106 -- this is an e-mail 15:59


12 that's dated January 27th, 2016. 15:59

13 And, I'll represent to you that the previous 15:59

14 day is the day that Anthony Levandowski had told you 15:59

15 he was resigning. If you actually look at the bottom 15:59

16 of the e-mail, you say: 15:59

17  15:59

18 Do you see that? 15:59

19 A Yep. 15:59

20 Q Okay. Now, in the -- have you seen this 15:59

21 e-mail before? 15:59

22 A I mean, I'm CCed on this e-mail. 15:59

23 Q Okay. How recently have you seen this 15:59

24 e-mail? 15:59

25 A Very, very recently, and not since then. 15:59

1 Q Okay. If you look on this e-mail, in the 15:59
2 second, I'll call it, cell of the string, there is an 16:00
3 e-mail from John Krafcik. 16:00
4 Do you see that? 16:00
5 A Yep. 16:00
6 Q And, you were on this string; right? 16:00
7 A It's kind of hard to -- 16:00
8 Q You can see at the top that you're CCed on 16:00
9 it? 16:00
10 A Yeah. 16:00
11 Q And you see on that paragraph, he says: 16:00
12 "We believe" -- 16:00
13 The very last paragraph says: 16:00
14 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] 16:00
17 Do you see that? 16:00
18 A Yeah. 16:00
19 Q Do you remember reading that statement? 16:00
20 A I don't remember reading that statement. 16:00
21 But, I mean... 16:00
22 Q Do you remember being concerned about that at 16:00
23 all? 16:00
24 A I mean, I don't think it's, like, a great 16:00
25 thing, but it also is not inherently illegal 16:00

1 necessarily. 16:01

2 Q Are you aware that Google's accusation today 16:01

3 is that six weeks before this e-mail, before 16:01

4 Mr. Levandowski resigned, he's accused of having 16:01

5 downloaded an extensive volume of information from 16:01

6 Google? 16:01

7 MR. VAN NEST: To the extent he's asking 16:01

8 about allegations, to the extent you learned them from 16:01

9 a lawyer -- 16:01

10 THE WITNESS: Yeah. 16:01

11 MR. VAN NEST: -- I'm instructing you not to 16:01

12 answer. 16:01

13 THE WITNESS: I mean -- 16:01

14 MR. VAN NEST: If you have independent 16:01

15 knowledge, you can state it. 16:01

16 THE WITNESS: Yeah, I don't have any 16:01

17 independent knowledge. I've read that in the press, 16:01

18 certainly. 16:01

19 MR. CHATTERJEE: All right. 16:01

20 Q Did you -- were you aware of it at the time? 16:01

21 A No, I was not aware of it at the time. 16:01

22 Q Were -- were you aware that there were 16:01

23 concerns that Mr. Levandowski was trying to recruit 16:01

24 people to go to this new entity from Google? 16:01

25 A I mean, again, I sort of -- I testified 16:01

1 already I was kind of aware of general concerns about 16:01
2 these kind of things. I don't think I was, like -- 16:01
3 certainly not aware of all the detail around that 16:02
4 that's come out in the press and so on. 16:02

5 Q And, if you'd go to one paragraph earlier 16:02
6 than the line I just read you. It says: 16:02

7 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] 16:02

12 Do you see that? 16:02

13 A Yeah, sure. 16:02

14 Q Did you make retention calls to try and make 16:02
15 sure people stayed at Project Chauffeur? 16:02

16 A I don't think so. But, I mean, I don't 16:02
17 routinely do that, so -- 16:02

18 Q But you were aware, as of January 27th, 2016, 16:02
19 that people at -- on the Chauffeur team believed that 16:02
20 Anthony Levandowski was trying to recruit as many as 16:02
21 dozens of people from the team; right? 16:02

22 A I don't know. I mean, I got this e-mail. 16:03
23 Like, I don't know that that means it's all true. And 16:03
24 there was a lot of emotion around, like, the day after 16:03
25 he left. 16:03

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

1 Q You're aware that -- that the head of the 16:03
2 group was telling you this; right? 16:03
3 A I mean, I got this e-mail, yeah. 16:03
4 Q Did you express any concern in response to 16:03
5 it? 16:03
6 A I mean, we were obviously concerned about 16:03
7 this. I mean, that's resulted in these proceedings. 16:03
8 Q Do you recall being concerned about it? 16:03
9 A Yeah, I was pretty concerned about all this. 16:03
10 Q Okay. What did you do? 16:03
11 A Well, I delegated it to people to look at it. 16:03
12 Q Who? 16:03
13 A John. 16:03
14 Q Anyone else? 16:03
15 A Don't recall. 16:03
16 Q Did you take any action yourself? 16:03
17 A I just told you what action I took. 16:03
18 Q Other than delegating? 16:03
19 A Don't think so. 16:03
20 Q Were you aware that the day Anthony 16:04
21 Levandowski left Google, he said he was going to 16:04
22 either join Kitty Hawk or form an autonomous trucking 16:04
23 company? 16:04
24 A No, I'm not aware of that. 16:04
25 Q Okay. Are you aware that he told that to 16:04

1 your HR group? 16:04

2 A I don't think so. 16:04

3 Q Would it have been an important thing for you 16:04

4 to know? 16:04

5 MR. VAN NEST: Object to the form of the 16:04

6 question. 16:04

7 THE WITNESS: I mean, I don't know. 16:04

8 MR. CHATTERJEE: Q. Who is Chelsea Bailey? 16:05

9 A I don't know. 16:05

10 (Document marked Exhibit 1111 16:05

11 for identification.) 16:05

12 MR. CHATTERJEE: Document marked as 16:05

13 Exhibit 1111. This is a document -- Exhibit 1111 is a 16:05

14 document, dated April 1st, 2016. 16:05

15 Q Do you see that? 16:05

16 A Yeah. 16:05

17 Q And -- and do you see in the second line, it 16:05

18 says: 16:06

19 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

20 [REDACTED] 16:06

21 A Sorry, I don't see that. Oh, on the top; 16:06

22 okay. 16:06

23 Q Second line. 16:06

24 A Okay. 16:06

25 Q Do you see that? 16:06

1 Are you aware, after Anthony Levandowski left 16:06
2 and up through, let's say, the middle of April of 16:06
3 2016, [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
4 [REDACTED]? 16:06
5 MR. VAN NEST: Again, exclude from your 16:06
6 answer, Mr. Page, anything you learned from a lawyer. 16:06
7 Other than that, you can answer. 16:06
8 THE WITNESS: Yeah, I don't have any 16:06
9 particular knowledge about that. 16:06
10 MR. CHATTERJEE: Q. Did Mr. Krafcik ever 16:06
11 talk to you about [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
12 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
13 [REDACTED]? 16:06
14 A Don't recall anything like that. 16:06
15 Q Do you know when the second bonus payment was 16:07
16 paid to Anthony Levandowski? 16:07
17 A No, I don't recall. 16:07
18 (Document marked Exhibit 1110 16:07
19 for identification.) 16:07
20 MR. CHATTERJEE: I'll mark this as 1110. 16:07
21 THE WITNESS: Thanks. 16:07
22 MR. VAN NEST: Big table. 16:07
23 MR. CHATTERJEE: What I've handed you, 16:07
24 Mr. Page, is a -- is a document, dated February 18th, 16:07
25 2016, from Chelsea Bailey to Ming Su and David Jen. 16:07

Page 186

1 Q Who is Ming Su? Do you know? 16:07

2 A I don't -- I don't know. 16:07

3 Q Do you know who David Jen is? 16:07

4 A David Jen? 16:08

5 Q David Jen. My apologies. 16:08

6 A No, I don't know who that is. 16:08

7 Q If you notice, there are three bullet points 16:08

8 on there. And it says: 16:08

9 "Anthony Levandowski: [REDACTED]." 16:08

10 Do you see that? 16:08

11 A Yeah, sure. 16:08

12 Q And the payment date is 7/28/2016. 16:08

13 Do you see that? 16:08

14 A Okay. 16:08

15 Q Okay. So, do you know if that payment was 16:08

16 made on 7/28/2016? 16:08

17 A No, I don't know. I do not know. 16:08

18 Q I'll represent to you that it was. And that 16:08

19 was after Mr. Krafcik said [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

20 [REDACTED] and after people had expressed to you he had 16:08

21 tried to recruit a whole bunch of people; right? 16:08

22 MR. VAN NEST: Objection to the form of the 16:08

23 question. 16:08

24 THE WITNESS: I mean, I believe that was done 16:08

25 on July 28th. 16:08

1 MR. CHATTERJEE: Q. And -- well, it was 16:08
2 after those other concerns were expressed; right? 16:08
3 A What's -- what's your question? 16:09
4 Q Did you ever try and stop that payment from 16:09
5 happening? 16:09
6 A Well, I mean, I'm not listed on any of this 16:09
7 information. 16:09
8 Q But you -- 16:09
9 A So it seems like it might have been a little 16:09
10 difficult. 16:09
11 Q So, you -- 16:09
12 A I have no -- no knowledge of whether that 16:09
13 payment was required anyways or -- I don't know. 16:09
14 Q Well -- 16:09
15 A Why would I stop the payment, I guess? 16:09
16 Q Did -- did you ever see a need to try and 16:09
17 stop the payment? 16:09
18 A I guess -- 16:09
19 MR. VAN NEST: Object to the form. 16:09
20 You may answer. 16:09
21 THE WITNESS: Did I ever see a need? I 16:09
22 wasn't just thinking about this particular issue in 16:09
23 the context of running a pretty large company. 16:09
24 But I -- I guess if I had known about it, I 16:09
25 might have considered stopping it if that were 16:09

1 possible, which I have no knowledge of whether that's 16:09

2 possible or not. 16:09

3 MR. CHATTERJEE: Q. Do you know who 16:09

4 authorized the payment of [REDACTED] in July 28, 2016? 16:09

5 A I mean, I've already testified, I have no 16:10

6 knowledge of this. 16:10

7 Q No, I'm wondering if you know who authorized 16:10

8 it. 16:10

9 If it wasn't you, who would have made that 16:10

10 decision? 16:10

11 A No, I did not know. 16:10

12 Q Do you know why Anthony Levandowski was not 16:10

13 sued for trade secret misappropriation? 16:10

14 MR. VAN NEST: Objection. 16:10

15 To the extent your knowledge comes from a 16:10

16 lawyer, don't answer the question. 16:10

17 If you have some independent knowledge, you 16:10

18 can provide it. 16:10

19 THE WITNESS: Yeah, I don't have any 16:10

20 independent knowledge of that. 16:10

21 MR. CHATTERJEE: Q. Did you know that he 16:10

22 wasn't sued for trade secret misappropriation? 16:10

23 A No. I'm afraid I don't know the details of 16:10

24 all that. 16:10

25 Q So, you don't know one way or another whether 16:10

1 he's been sued for trade secret misappropriation? 16:10

2 MR. VAN NEST: Object to the form of the 16:10

3 question. It's argumentative. 16:10

4 THE WITNESS: I mean, I've already testified 16:10

5 I didn't know. 16:10

6 MR. CHATTERJEE: Your answer was actually 16:10

7 unclear. 16:10

8 Q You don't know one way or the other whether 16:10

9 Mr. Levandowski has been sued for trade secret 16:10

10 misappropriation; right? 16:10

11 A Yeah, that seems like that means I don't 16:11

12 know. 16:11

13 Q So, you don't know? 16:11

14 A I already stated that twice. 16:11

15 Q Well, the way you answered the question, it's 16:11

16 not clear whether you don't understand my question. 16:11

17 A Okay. 16:11

18 MR. VAN NEST: Counsel, this is far afield 16:11

19 from anything that Judge Alsup authorized. You have 16:11

20 my CEO here. Let's stick with knowledge and facts and 16:11

21 not argument, please. 16:11

22 MR. CHATTERJEE: I'm just trying to 16:11

23 understand his answer, Mr. Van Nest. 16:11

24 MR. VAN NEST: No. This is an argumentative 16:11

25 line. You have the CEO here. You have limited time. 16:11

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

1 MR. CHATTERJEE: I do. Stop -- you can stop 16:11
2 using it up, Mr. Van Nest. 16:11
3 Q Do you know, one way or another, whether 16:11
4 Mr. Levandowski has been sued for trade secret 16:11
5 misappropriation? 16:11
6 MR. VAN NEST: Again, objection. That has 16:11
7 nothing to do with anything you are authorized to ask 16:11
8 about. I'll object to the form. He's answered it 16:11
9 three times now. 16:11
10 THE WITNESS: No, I said I don't know. 16:11
11 MR. CHATTERJEE: Q. Do you know why [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]? 16:11
14 MR. VAN NEST: Again, if any information you 16:11
15 have comes from a lawyer, don't provide it. 16:12
16 THE WITNESS: I don't know. 16:12
17 MR. CHATTERJEE: Q. You don't know? 16:12
18 A (Witness shakes head.) 16:12
19 Q Do you know the way that Google typically 16:12
20 retains things, like source code materials and design 16:12
21 specifications, and things like that? 16:12
22 MR. VAN NEST: I'll object to the form. 16:12
23 But you may answer. 16:12
24 THE WITNESS: Yeah, I'm not that familiar 16:12
25 with how we do that. 16:12

1 MR. CHATTERJEE: Q. Is there an online 16:12
2 repository, or do -- do you even know that? 16:12
3 A I mean, there's some code-based repository 16:12
4 thingy. 16:12
5 Q And, is it a Google specially designed 16:12
6 repository, or is it some other industry standard one? 16:12
7 A I mean, that is -- that -- I mean, we use 16:12
8 many different things. 16:12
9 Q Right. 16:12
10 I'm just asking if you know? 16:12
11 A We use many different things. I guess you 16:12
12 need a more specific -- 16:12
13 Q Do you know if Google uses Subversion, 16:12
14 typically? 16:13
15 A I don't know. 16:13
16 Q Are you familiar with how Subversion works? 16:13
17 A No, I'm not that familiar with it. 16:13
18 Q Okay. Do you know how many people have made 16:13
19 \$100 million from work they've done at Google? 16:13
20 A No, I don't know. 16:13
21 Q Can you give me an estimate? 16:13
22 A I might say, you know, a fairly significant 16:13
23 number of people. 16:13
24 MR. CHATTERJEE: How are we doing on time? 16:13
25 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: 3 hours and 34 minutes on 16:13

1 the record, Counsel. 16:13

2 MR. CHATTERJEE: Q. Do you know how many 16:13

3 people reported to Anthony Levandowski? 16:13

4 A No, I don't know. 16:13

5 Q Are you happy that Anthony Levandowski was 16:14

6 fired by Uber? 16:14

7 MR. VAN NEST: Objection to the form of the 16:14

8 question. 16:14

9 THE WITNESS: Am I happy? 16:14

10 MR. VAN NEST: It's got absolutely no 16:14

11 relevance. Counsel, again, you're wasting our time. 16:14

12 We have four hours. I object to the form of the 16:14

13 question. 16:14

14 If you have an opinion, you can answer. 16:14

15 THE WITNESS: I mean, I'm generally pretty 16:14

16 sad about the situation. 16:14

17 MR. CHATTERJEE: Q. Why? 16:14

18 MR. VAN NEST: Again, object to the form. 16:14

19 These aren't fact questions that are likely to lead to 16:14

20 anything discoverable whatsoever. 16:14

21 MR. CHATTERJEE: Q. So, go ahead and answer. 16:14

22 He didn't instruct you not to answer. 16:14

23 A Sorry? 16:14

24 Q You said you're pretty sad about the 16:14

25 situation. I asked why. He made an objection. So go 16:14

1 ahead and answer. 16:15

2 A I mean, I think it's a tough situation. It's 16:15

3 been, I don't know, 18 years or something we've had 16:15

4 the company, and this is the first time we're in a 16:15

5 situation like this. 16:15

6 Q Can you identify a single trade secret that 16:15

7 Anthony Levandowski took? 16:15

8 MR. VAN NEST: Again, to the extent your 16:15

9 answer would depend on a communication with a lawyer, 16:15

10 I instruct you not to answer it. 16:15

11 If you have some independent knowledge, you 16:15

12 may provide it. 16:15

13 THE WITNESS: Yeah, I mean, I think there's a 16:15

14 number of things at issue. I'm not familiar with the 16:15

15 details of it. 16:15

16 MR. CHATTERJEE: Q. Have you reviewed the 16:15

17 trade secret disclosure at all? 16:15

18 A I don't think so. 16:15

19 Q Was your phone imaged for this case? 16:15

20 A I'm not sure. 16:15

21 MR. CHATTERJEE: All right. Let's take a 16:15

22 quick break. 16:15

23 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are off the record at 16:15

24 4:16 p.m. 16:15

25 (Recess taken.) 16:15

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

1 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the record 16:17
2 at 4:28 p.m. 16:28
3 16:28
4 FURTHER EXAMINATION 16:28
5 BY MR. GONZALEZ: 16:28
6 Q Mr. Page, let me show you a document that 16:28
7 we've marked as Exhibit 1108. 16:28
8 A Thank you. 16:28
9 (Document marked Exhibit 1108 16:28
10 for identification.) 16:28
11 MR. GONZALEZ: For the record, 1108 is a 16:28
12 one-page e-mail, WAYMO '11773. This is an e-mail from 16:28
13 Mr. Salesky to Mr. Levandowski, January 23, 2016. 16:28
14 Q And he says: 16:28
15 "Chris and I think would be great roles for 16:28
16 you." 16:28
17 And he lists three things. I just want you 16:28
18 to look at those three things, 1, 2, 3. And I want 16:28
19 your opinion as to whether or not you agree that, at 16:29
20 the time, that would have been a great role for 16:29
21 Anthony Levandowski? 16:29
22 MR. VAN NEST: Take a moment to review the 16:29
23 document. 16:29
24 THE WITNESS: This is, like, right before he 16:29
25 left? 16:29

1 MR. GONZALEZ: Correct. 16:29

2 THE WITNESS: All right. 16:29

3 (Reading document.) 16:29

4 Sorry. I forget the question now, now that 16:29

5 I've read it. 16:29

6 MR. GONZALEZ: Q. The question is whether 16:29

7 you agree with Chris and Mr. Salesky, that these three 16:29

8 items would have been good for assignments for 16:29

9 Mr. Levandowski? 16:29

10 MR. VAN NEST: Object to the form of the 16:29

11 question. 16:29

12 You can answer it. 16:29

13 MR. GONZALEZ: Let me rephrase it. 16:29

14 Q Looking at points 1, 2, and 3, do you believe 16:29

15 that, in January of 2016, these would have been good 16:29

16 assignments for Mr. Levandowski? 16:29

17 A I guess in what context? For him or for us 16:30

18 or for... 16:30

19 Q For him to do within Project Chauffeur. 16:30

20 A I guess my analysis of this having -- this is 16:30

21 not exactly answering your question. But my analysis 16:30

22 of this, understanding the dynamics, is they're trying 16:30

23 to get him to do something that he's not likely going 16:30

24 to want to do. And, I'm sure if he were excited about 16:30

25 this, it would be helpful. 16:30

1 Q Do you think that Mr. Levandowski's skill set 16:30
2 would have made him a good candidate for these 16:30
3 three items? 16:30

4 A I mean, these are all, you know, somewhat 16:30
5 related to things he knows about. So, I think if he 16:30
6 were excited about it, he could do -- if he were 16:30
7 excited about it, I'm sure he could do a good job on 16:31
8 those kind of things, probably. But I doubt he would 16:31
9 be excited about it. 16:31

10 (Document marked Exhibit 1107 16:31
11 for identification.) 16:31

12 MR. GONZALEZ: Let me show you a document 16:31
13 that we marked as Exhibit 1107. 16:31

14 Q You're familiar with the letter that you 16:31
15 issued in connection with your IPO? 16:31

16 A The 2004 founders letter? 16:31

17 Q Yes. 16:31

18 A (Witness nods head.) 16:31

19 Q And that's what this is? 16:31

20 A I haven't read the whole thing, but I assume 16:31
21 it is, if you're representing that. 16:31

22 Q Right. 16:31

23 Is that your electronic signature there? 16:31

24 A It looks like it, yeah. Thank you. 16:31

25 Q And, if you'll look at the fourth page. 16:31

1 MR. VAN NEST: What's it say at the top, 16:32
2 Counsel? 16:32
3 THE WITNESS: It says page -- 16:32
4 MR. GONZALEZ: Page '414. 16:32
5 THE WITNESS: (Complies.) 16:32
6 Okay. 16:32
7 MR. VAN NEST: Okay. Thank you. 16:32
8 MR. GONZALEZ: Q. It says in part, second 16:32
9 paragraph from the bottom: 16:32
10 "We encourage our employees, in addition to 16:32
11 their regular projects, to spend 20 percent of their 16:32
12 time working on what they think will most benefit 16:32
13 Google." 16:32
14 Do you see that? 16:32
15 A Yeah, sure. 16:32
16 Q That was intended to get people to be 16:32
17 creative in what they were doing? 16:32
18 A Yeah, and work on things that can help the 16:32
19 company. 16:32
20 Q And that's something that's been the policy 16:32
21 of the company ever since it was formed? 16:32
22 A I mean, there's -- in varying ways, I think, 16:32
23 like, people get upset about it sometimes when 16:32
24 managers do different things. But I think in general, 16:32
25 we like this idea still. 16:32

Page 198

1 Q The idea is to get people to think outside of 16:32
2 the box? 16:32

3 A To work on things they're passionate about 16:32
4 that can help the company. 16:33

5 Q Do you think Anthony did that? 16:33

6 MR. VAN NEST: Objection to the form of the 16:33
7 question. 16:33

8 THE WITNESS: Yeah, in what sense? 16:33

9 MR. GONZALEZ: Q. Do you think that he 16:33
10 worked on projects, such as yours, because he was -- 16:33

11 A Well, that's not the point of the 20 percent. 16:33
12 The 20 percent -- it says to benefit Google. So, I 16:33
13 mean, that's just a different thing. 16:33

14 Q Did you think that his work on [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] 16:33

18 Q You said that some people don't like the 16:33
19 policy. 16:33

20 What do you mean by that? 16:33

21 A I mean, sometimes -- but, I mean, the 16:33
22 managers and stuff obviously sometimes get upset about 16:33
23 this. But I think in general, it's a good thing. 16:33

24 Q When you say "the managers get upset," that's 16:33
25 because they want 100 percent of their employees' 16:33

1 time? 16:33

2 A Yeah. 16:33

3 Q Have you personally conducted any search for 16:33

4 documents that might be relevant in this litigation? 16:33

5 A I mean, generally, we have people that do 16:34

6 discovery. I was asked about phone records. And I -- 16:34

7 you know, I represented I don't recall any text 16:34

8 messages with certain people. 16:34

9 Q How often do you delete text messages from 16:34

10 your phone? 16:34

11 A I don't recall having deleted any. 16:34

12 Q What forms of communication do you use, other 16:34

13 than standard e-mail and text messages? 16:34

14 MR. VAN NEST: Objection to the form of the 16:34

15 question; assumes facts not in evidence. 16:34

16 THE WITNESS: I mean, I typically talk to 16:34

17 people and e-mail them, text them. So, I think that 16:34

18 was well covered in discovery. I don't think there 16:34

19 are other methods. 16:34

20 MR. GONZALEZ: Q. In the Silicon Valley, 16:34

21 would you agree that it's common to recruit employees 16:34

22 from other companies? 16:34

23 A I mean, normally, you hire people who are 16:34

24 working somewhere else. 16:34

25 Q And that includes hiring people from 16:34

1 competitors; true? 16:34

2 A Yes. 16:34

3 Q That's something that Google does on a 16:35

4 regular basis; correct? 16:35

5 MR. VAN NEST: Objection to the form. 16:35

6 THE WITNESS: I mean, we definitely hire 16:35

7 people from other companies who may or may not be 16:35

8 competitors. 16:35

9 MR. GONZALEZ: Q. And you've approved of the 16:35

10 hiring of people from your competitors; true? 16:35

11 A I don't recall particularly. 16:35

12 Q But you've hired some people from Uber; 16:35

13 haven't you? 16:35

14 A I mean, me personally or the company? 16:35

15 Q The company. 16:35

16 A I assume the company has hired a number of 16:35

17 people from Uber. 16:35

18 Q And the company has hired people from Tesla? 16:35

19 A I assume so, yeah. 16:35

20 Q Let me show you a document that was 16:35

21 previously marked as Exhibit 1031. 1031, for the 16:35

22 record, has Bates stamp Nos. WAYMO '4175 through 16:36

23 '4193. 16:36

24 Sir, I note you're flipping through the 16:36

25 document, which is fine. 16:36

Page 202

1 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
14 Q If you'll turn to page 12 of the PowerPoint. 16:38
15 It has page '186 in the little numbers on the bottom 16:38
16 right. 16:38
17 A (Witness complies.) 16:38
18 Okay. 16:38
19 Q It says -- the heading is: 16:39
20 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] 16:39
22 Then it has a subheading that says: 16:39
23 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] 16:39
25 Do you see that? 16:39

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

1 A I mean, I can read the slides, yeah. 16:39

2 Q Is that the plan? 16:39

3 A No, I don't think so. But, I mean, I 16:39

4 didn't -- I mean, I've already said I'm not really 16:39

5 familiar with this document. I can read the whole 16:39

6 document if you'd like. But you're taking -- 16:39

7 Q Well -- 16:39

8 A -- one page out of context, potentially. 16:39

9 Q -- I -- I don't want to kill all my time. On 16:39

10 the other hand, I'd like to know whether you read it. 16:39

11 So, if it would help you to look through the rest of 16:39

12 the document, please take a moment and flip through 16:39

13 the rest of the document to see if it refreshes your 16:39

14 recollection of whether you have reviewed this before 16:39

15 I showed it to you today. 16:39

16 A I mean, you know, my interpretation of this, 16:39

17 with limited context, they're just saying that [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] 16:40

22 MR. VAN NEST: Mr. Page, he asked you whether 16:40

23 you thought you had read this back in the day. Do you 16:40

24 know? 16:40

25 THE WITNESS: No, I don't know whether I read 16:40

1 it or not. 16:40

2 MR. GONZALEZ: All right. 16:40

3 Q Looking at the document today, when you see 16:40

4 the phrase [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

5 [REDACTED] what do you 16:40

6 understand that to mean? 16:40

7 A Well, I mean, they're saying, like -- [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

8 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

9 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

10 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

11 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

12 [REDACTED] 16:40

13 Q By the way, there isn't any question in your 16:41

14 mind that at least as of this date when this document 16:41

15 is being prepared and circulated within Google, that 16:41

16 you are now competing with Uber; is that right? 16:41

17 A I'm not -- I mean, I think -- I think Uber is 16:41

18 definitely a competitor of -- for self-driving cars. 16:41

19 I think they have very big business, which is 16:41

20 different than what we do. And, I think history will 16:41

21 tell. I don't -- I don't fully know the answer to 16:41

22 that question. 16:41

23 Q In your mind, when did Uber become your 16:41

24 competitor for self-driving cars? 16:41

25 When did -- when did the two of you become 16:41

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

1 competitors in that field? 16:41

2 MR. VAN NEST: I think it was asked and 16:41

3 answered -- 16:41

4 THE WITNESS: Yeah, I was going to say -- 16:41

5 MR. VAN NEST: -- earlier today. So, I'll 16:41

6 object to the form. 16:41

7 I -- I think you can answer it again, 16:41

8 Mr. Page, if you have a different answer. 16:41

9 MR. GONZALEZ: Well -- 16:41

10 THE WITNESS: Yeah, and I already kind of 16:41

11 just said the opposite. It's that I'm not sure. I 16:41

12 mean, I think it's a complicated set of issues. 16:41

13 MR. GONZALEZ: Right. 16:42

14 Q You said Uber started competing with you? 16:42

15 A Yeah. 16:42

16 Q All right. 16:42

17 When it talks here about [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] 16:42

Page 207

1 remember. 16:43

2 MR. VAN NEST: I'll object to the form. 16:43

3 Huh? 16:43

4 MR. GONZALEZ: He doesn't -- he doesn't 16:43

5 remember if he has seen it. 16:43

6 MR. VAN NEST: Do you have any different 16:43

7 answer, Mr. Page? 16:43

8 THE WITNESS: I mean, I already kind of gave 16:43

9 my interpretation of that. But I can spend more time 16:43

10 on the document, if you'd like. 16:43

11 MR. GONZALEZ: Here's the distinction that 16:43

12 I'm trying to draw. 16:43

13 Q You said that, at some point, Uber became a 16:43

14 competitor because of something that Uber did in 16:43

15 investing in autonomous vehicles. 16:43

16 Do you recall that? 16:43

17 A Yeah. 16:43

18 Q Okay. I'd like to ask you about a different 16:43

19 type of competition. 16:43

20 Setting aside autonomous vehicles, would you 16:44

21 agree that, as of the date of this document, March 19, 16:44

22 2015, you were competing with Uber [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

23 [REDACTED]? 16:44

24 A I mean, not in a significant way, I think. 16:44

25 Q But, [REDACTED] 16:44

[illegible]

Page 209

Page 210

1 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
2 [REDACTED] 16:47
3 MR. GONZALEZ: Q. Is that what makes you say 16:47
4 that it's being taken out of context, [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
5 [REDACTED]? 16:47
6 A I don't know. I mean, I don't know to -- I'm 16:47
7 happy to spend -- given the amount of time we're 16:47
8 spending questioning, I think I should spend more time 16:47
9 on the document itself, because I don't think I'm 16:47
10 giving that much insight into this versus just reading 16:48
11 the slide. 16:48
12 Q We have 20 minutes left? 16:48
13 MR. VAN NEST: You know I'd give it to you if 16:48
14 I could, Mr. Gonzalez. You know that. 16:48
15 MR. GONZALEZ: I even marked my copy, but 16:48
16 that's okay. 16:48
17 THE WITNESS: The whole point of this -- 16:48
18 like, one of their main points here is, [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
19 [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
20 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
21 [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
22 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
23 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
24 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
25 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
26 [REDACTED] [REDACTED] 16:49

1 [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
11 Q All right. 16:49
12 Let me, at the risk of greatly disappointing 16:49
13 you, show you the last document -- 16:49
14 A Okay. 16:49
15 Q -- that we're going to use, which is 16:49
16 Exhibit 1109. 16:49
17 (Document marked Exhibit 1109 16:49
18 for identification.) 16:49
19 MR. GONZALEZ: Q. Is this an e-mail chain 16:49
20 between you and Mr. Levandowski? 16:49
21 A It looks like it, yeah. 16:49
22 Q And, you'll notice that, after saying that 16:49
23 [REDACTED], Mr. Levandowski says: 16:50
24 [REDACTED] 16:50
25 Do you see that? 16:50

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

1 A Sure. 16:50

2 Q Do you agree with that? 16:50

3 A I mean, [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

4 [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

5 [REDACTED] 16:50

6 Q All right. 16:50

7 He also says: 16:50

8 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

9 [REDACTED] 16:50

10 Do you see that? 16:50

11 A Sure. 16:50

12 Q Do you agree with that? 16:50

13 A I mean, [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

14 [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

15 [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

16 [REDACTED] [REDACTED] 16:51

17 Q And, when he says [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

18 [REDACTED] do you agree with that? 16:51

19 A Yes, somewhat. There's some subtlety, I 16:51

20 think, in this. But, [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

21 [REDACTED] [REDACTED] 16:51

22 Q Sir, let me ask you just a few last 16:51

23 questions. 16:51

24 Did [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

25 [REDACTED]? 16:51

Page 214

1 MR. VAN NEST: Object to the form -- 16:51

2 THE WITNESS: What is that? 16:51

3 MR. VAN NEST: Object to the form of the 16:51

4 question. 16:51

5 MR. GONZALEZ: Q. To your knowledge, did 16:51

6 [REDACTED] ? 16:51

7 A I'm not sure what that is. 16:51

8 Q You've never heard of that company? 16:52

9 A Don't remember hearing of it. 16:52

10 Q Have you heard of a company called Odin Wave? 16:52

11 A Maybe very recently. 16:52

12 Q During the course of the litigation? 16:52

13 A (Witness nods head.) 16:52

14 Q Other than conversations in connection with 16:52

15 the litigation, were you familiar with Odin Wave? 16:52

16 A No, I don't recall that. 16:52

17 Q With respect to Mr. Levandowski, do you 16:52

18 believe that Mr. Levandowski should be able to work in 16:52

19 the autonomous vehicle space going forward? 16:52

20 MR. VAN NEST: Object to the form of the 16:52

21 question; calls for a legal conclusion. 16:52

22 THE WITNESS: Yeah. I mean, I'm not a 16:52

23 lawyer. 16:52

24 MR. GONZALEZ: Setting aside the lawyer 16:52

25 point, I'm not asking legally. 16:52

Page 215

1 Q I just want your opinion as an individual. 16:52

2 You know Mr. Levandowski. You know what the 16:52

3 allegations are in this case. 16:52

4 A Well, there's information that's not come out 16:52

5 yet. The proceeding is not done. I generally believe 16:52

6 in the U.S. system and the process we're all 16:53

7 undergoing here, and I'd like to see the results of 16:53

8 that. 16:53

9 Q Sitting here today, do you have an opinion, 16:53

10 one way or the other, as to whether Mr. Levandowski 16:53

11 should be allowed to work with autonomous vehicles? 16:53

12 MR. VAN NEST: Again, I object to the form. 16:53

13 It's not a fact question that -- 16:53

14 THE WITNESS: I mean -- 16:53

15 MR. VAN NEST: -- will lead to -- 16:53

16 THE WITNESS: -- I don't know the answer to 16:53

17 that. 16:53

18 MR. GONZALEZ: Q. And then maybe my final 16:53

19 question: The bonus that Mr. Levandowski received, 16:53

20 120 million, whatever it was, do you believe, or do 16:53

21 you have an opinion, as to whether that needs to be 16:53

22 paid back? 16:53

23 MR. VAN NEST: Again, objection to the form 16:53

24 of the question. It calls for a legal conclusion. 16:53

25 THE WITNESS: Yeah, I have no -- no knowledge 16:53

1 or no answer to that. 16:53

2 MR. GONZALEZ: All right. 16:53

3 Thank you, sir. That's all I have. 16:53

4 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: This is the end of today's 16:53

5 deposition of Mr. Larry Page. We are off the record 16:53

6 at 4:54 p.m. 16:53

7 The total number of media used was five. 16:53

8 They will be retained by Veritext. 16:54

9 Thank you. 16:54

10 MR. VAN NEST: Before we go off the record, 16:54

11 we want to designate the transcript as "Attorneys' 16:54

12 Eyes Only, Highly Confidential, Per the Protective 16:54

13 Order." 16:54

14 MR. GONZALEZ: All right. And then I'll just 16:54

15 note that there's an issue that we had to confer about 16:54

16 documents that the witness saw before his deposition 16:54

17 to refresh recollection. 16:54

18 MR. VAN NEST: Thank you. 16:54

19 (WHEREUPON, the deposition ended 16:54

20 at 4:54 p.m.) 16:54

21

22

23

24

25

J U R A T

I, Larry Page, do hereby certify under penalty of perjury, that I have read the foregoing transcript of my deposition in the matter of Waymo LLC vs. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., taken on July 17, 2017, that I have made such corrections as appear noted herein in ink, initialed by me; that my testimony as contained herein, as corrected, is true and correct.

DATED this ____ day of _____, 2017,
at _____.

SIGNATURE OF WITNESS

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, ANDREA M. IGNACIO, hereby certify that the witness in the foregoing deposition was by me duly sworn to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth in the within-entitled cause;

That said deposition was taken in shorthand by me, a disinterested person, at the time and place therein stated, and that the testimony of the said witness was thereafter reduced to typewriting, by computer, under my direction and supervision;

That before completion of the deposition, review of the transcript [x] was [] was not requested. If requested, any changes made by the deponent (and provided to the reporter) during the period allowed are appended hereto.

I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for either or any of the parties to the said deposition, nor in any way interested in the event of this cause, and that I am not related to any of the parties thereto.

Dated: 7/18/2017



ANDREA M. IGNACIO,

RPR, CRR, CCRR, CLR, CSR No. 9830